The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1919 No. 2813

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 853

EDITORIALS:

The Growing Revolt Against the Treaty 856
Pogroms in Poland 857
Peace and the Poets 858
A Curious Fancy 859
Clearing the Air 859

THE OPENING OF CONGRESS. By Lincoln Colcord 860

A COMPLACENT FOUNDATION. By Joseph Jastrow 862

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE:

Toward a New International. By Herbert W. Horwill 864

WALT WHITMAN: A CENTENARY VIEW. By Percy H. Boynton 866

BLOCKADE. By Kathryn Peck 868

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 868

CORRESPONDENCE 869

LITERATURE:

Mental Reconstruction 871
Symonds Redivivus 873
Pawns in the Game 874
The Field of Prints 875
Spain Sees Herself 876

BOOKS IN BRIEF 877

MAKING AMERICANS. By Felix Morley 878

CHEMISTRY, PHYSICS, AND WAR. By Arthur W. Goodspeed 879

DRAMA: A Note on Tragedy. By Ludwig Lewisohn 879

FINANCE: Reviving the Bond Market. By William Justus Boies 880

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 881

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 883

GRATIFYING, indeed, is the news that the "Triple Alliance" of British railwaymen, coal miners and transport workers, the most powerful unions in Great Britain, have served notice on Premier Lloyd George that he must at once abolish conscription, withdraw all troops from Russia, lift the blockade of Germany, release all the conscientious objectors still in prison, and raise exemption from the income tax to $1,200 a year. The propriety of the last demand alone is to be questioned. The wisdom and justice of the others is obvious; they do honor alike to the humanity and honesty of the unions. Best of all, this ultimatum is serving proper notice upon Mr. Lloyd George that he is not the sole arbiter of Great Britain's destinies, just as the news that a great trade-union congress next week will denounce the treaty as far too severe is reputed to have had a good deal to do with the reported intention of the "Big Three" to make certain changes in the sacrosanct treaty which the Germans were first told they would have to take unaltered, without discussion, whether they liked it or not. Drunk with power as the "Big Three" are, it is of the utmost importance that they should realize that they are not to continue their despotic course much longer, but that, with the coming of peace, they will have masters with whom they will speedily have to reckon when democracy resumes its sway again. Meanwhile, the "Triple Alliance" by its action is serving democracy everywhere.

THE loathsome hypocrisy of the Administration's Russian policy becomes clearer with every passing week. On January 8, 1918, Mr. Wilson declared that the treatment of Russia would be the "acid test" of our goodwill, and stated as one of the Fourteen Points "the evacuation of all Russian territory [it was Germany which held it then] and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest coöperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing." Since that time we have seen Russia invaded from at least three directions by American, British, French, and other Allied troops, with Mr. Wilson's consent. We have seen public opinion in the United States systematically poisoned concerning Russia, with the connivance of high-placed Government officials, and Mr. Wilson has spoken no word. We have blushed with shame at the perfidy and dishonor of the Sisson documents, and Mr. Wilson was busy elsewhere. We have seen Russia invaded from the north to meet the German menace, and from the east to aid the heroic Czecho-Slovaks. The Germans are disarmed, and the very existence of the Czecho-Slovaks is all but forgotten, but American armies are still unwillingly fighting in the north and in Siberia.

AFTER honest and simple-minded Americans had protested so loudly that the Administration no longer dared ignore their demands, we were promised that our troops would be withdrawn from Archangel—and straightway a new force of engineers was dispatched to Northern Russia. Now we read that "American railroad troops are playing an important part in the rapid advance of the Allied troops southward along the Murmansk railway." Meanwhile our troops remain in Siberia, and the War Department is recruiting 8,000 volunteers for service there. An Associated Press dispatch from Omsk states that the so-called All-Russian Government there has requested Major General Graves not to send American troops farther into the interior of Siberia, the desire being "to preserve the existing friendly relations with America which, in view of the American Government's undefined stand on Bolshevism, might otherwise be jeopardized." The Omsk Government need not worry. Mr. Wilson has been carrying on war against Soviet Russia for ten months, and General Graves, in a message to his troops, declares that "the policy to be followed by our troops in any country is one to be determined by the Executive." So much for Wilsonian *Realpolitik* by comparison with the old-fashioned theory that it is the business of Congress to declare war. And General Graves has apparently caught even the President's phraseology, for he adds that "every nation has its own ideals and traditions which should be respected by all, and especially by guests, as we are." Having seized long stretches of the Trans-Siberian Railway, we appear to be the kind of "guests" who make their entrance by climbing up the back porch. It is hard to believe that the American people, who are for the most part honest and kindly folk, can much longer stomach the Administration policy in Russia of combined burglary and starvation, coupled with pious phrases. There is surely honesty and courage enough in Congress to put an end to this iniquity.

PUBLICATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

YET the latest news from Paris is that the Council of Four have decided to recognize conditionally the Kolchak and Denikine Governments. Even a paper like the *New York Tribune* admits that "Admiral Kolchak may have some reactionary tendencies," and diligent search by the *Nation* among the Russians of all shades of opinion in New York has thus far failed to disclose one willing over his own name to write an article favoring this friend of the old Czarist régime. Yet this is the man, set up by Allied Governments and supported by Allied munitions, whom we are asked to recognize as the democratic savior of Russia. Public opinion is deliberately being prepared for this step, which is indeed only the logical development of the policy of canting imperialism that Mr. Wilson has pursued in Russia during the past year. The pro-Kolchak announcement which we print elsewhere, put out by certain agents of Siberian coöperatives, and widely exploited in the attempt to represent the whole coöperative movement as favoring Kolchak, was promptly followed by a counter-statement from Alexander Berkenheim, vice-president of the All-Russian Central Union of Coöperative Societies, who comes nearest of any one in the United States to being an authoritative spokesman. Mr. Berkenheim denies the right of any person here to speak for the coöperatives politically, and indicates that whatever the opinions of individuals (he is himself anti-Bolshevist), the coöperatives are purely economic organizations and as such do not take sides in Russian political struggles. Mr. Berkenheim has for two months been engaged in a vain effort to get the permission of the Administration to send to Russia even a single shipload of the great quantity of goods which the coöperatives stand ready to pay for and to ship to Russia for the use of their own members. If the Administration is now at last to crown its policy of starving Soviet Russia and seizing the Trans-Siberian Railway, by recognizing the notorious counter-revolutionist at Omsk, its democratic non-interference in Russian affairs will be as nearly complete as can be hoped for in an imperfect world.

THE difference between the politically and the economically minded man has rarely been more instructively illustrated than in the contrast between President Wilson and his Paris confrères on the one hand and Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank, on the other. The Peace Conference has sat in Paris for five months quarreling over boundaries and reparations and mandates and a League of Armed Nations, twisting and turning, seeking by compromises and evasions to avoid confession of financial and moral bankruptcy. Mr. Vanderlip has spent three months travelling all over Europe, and he returns to speak thus to New York's business men, assembled at a meeting of the Economic Club:

> I believe it is possible that there may be let loose in Europe forces that will be more terribly destructive than have been the forces of the great war. I believe we can probably save the situation from anything as fearful as that. If I did not believe it, I would hesitate to say what I shall about conditions.
>
> If I were to try to put into words what I sum up as the most essential thing to grasp about the situation in Europe, the two words would be "Paralyzed industry." There is an idleness, there is a lack of production throughout Europe, and indeed in England, that you can hardly comprehend. There is a difficulty about a resumption of work on ordinary peace affairs that I think nobody could be made to comprehend that did not see it on the ground.
>
> Is it hopeless, or can we do something about it? We have got to do something about it. If we do not, it will do something about us. Well, what can we do? I do not believe that we can furnish the credit to rehabilitate the governmental credits of Europe. Many of them are too badly involved already. I do believe that we must furnish those things that are essential to the re-starting of industry in Europe, and I believe that we must furnish those things to all Europe. It will not do to use the usual methods of money-lenders, pick out the best security and say we will take a chance on this and let the rest go. We have got to loan in the measure of the necessity rather than in the measure of the security, because there is no security anywhere as long as you will have part of Europe idle, in want and hunger, ready for Bolshevism, ready for some uprising, something that will better their condition, and I want to tell you that there is a minority in every country in Europe, an active minority, that believe in a programme for the upsetting of social order.

Mr. Vanderlip displays great insight and courage in speaking this much-needed word. It will require intelligence, goodwill, and whole-hearted coöperation on both sides of the Atlantic to bring about the industrial rehabilitation that is Europe's immediate need. Apparently it is to business men of broad vision, rather than to political leaders, that the world must look for wise action.

THE only group in Germany which sees before it a clear course and proceeds along it confidently is the Independent Socialist party. Whatever the Government may do, the near future quite clearly belongs to them. If the German delegates at Versailles sign the treaty, as the Independents urge, public indignation and the economic terrorism of the peace terms must inevitably overthrow the present Government. If the delegates refuse to sign, the prospect of starvation and Allied military pressure will accomplish the same end. So argue the leaders of the Independents. They urge that the treaty be signed, relying upon internal revolt and an appeal to the international spirit of the Allied proletariat to save Germany from destruction. Plainly, their political wisdom lies in their firm refusal to take the responsibility for either course. Hugo Haase has repudiated the suggestion that an Independent Ministry be formed, and the *Freiheit* comments on his decision in these words: "The Independent Socialist party does not dream of taking the blame for the world war and the terrible consequences for Germany from the shoulders of those responsible, the Scheidemanns and Erzbergers, the Clericals and Democrats, who zealously aided the late Government's war policy, granted all credits, and by their attitude prevented an early termination of the war. Let them settle the bankrupt estate. The Independents would be just as short-sighted as the Social Democratic party if for the sake of a sham success they took over the Government. . . . We have other tasks than to pick chestnuts from the fire for the bankrupt politicians." The Government may save itself for the time being by making a stand at Versailles on President Wilson's Fourteen Points and other early indiscretions, and by the domestic expedient of a popular referendum on the peace terms. But no referendum can ultimately save Germany, or mitigate the economic ruin which the treaty holds for her. If the treaty stands, Germany is destined, soon or late, to face another overthrow, more complete than anything which has so far taken place. And it will be an overthrow instigated and accomplished by the Allies as surely as if their agents had travelled to Berlin to spread the gospel of revolt.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE rapid way in which the great estates of England are coming into the market and being broken up appears clearly from a two-page advertisement of one firm of auctioneers in a recent issue of the London *Times*. There are fifty-five separate announcements of country places for sale, the largest of which totals 145,400 acres, and the smallest, twenty-four. All told, this offering comprises no less than 441,560 acres of land. There are several tidy lots of 55,000 and 50,000 acres and another sizable homestead of 114,569. The latter, like the other large properties, is in Scotland. With one of the Scotch offerings go the Burra Islands, Shetland, "3,300 acres, with rough shooting, sea trout, and sea fishing." Some of the estates offered carry with them whole villages, and there are numerous farms, while hotels, inns, schools, and golf courses may be had for the asking—one "freehold agricultural estate" carrying with it "three water-power corn-mills and two temperance inns." The various portions of the estates are offered separately, and it will be interesting to see whether they are broken up, or whether they are bought and held together by other rich men who are not yet wholly plucked of their revenues by the high British income tax. If the great estates are really beginning to go to small holders, it should mean a far brighter outlook for British agriculture.

WINNIPEG is still marooned by the great strike. Government officials have taken a hand in the dickering, but so far, to no purpose. The postal clerks and telephone operators disregarded the Government's ultimatum of the Federal blacklist and remained out. Volunteer workers are trying to sort the accumulated arrears of mail, and to maintain some kind of transportation and communication services. The latest news is that the strike has spread. Calgary and Edmonton are already tied up as tight as Winnipeg; the strike vote has been passed at Regina, and will be in effect probably by the time this item is in the reader's hands. The entire absence of violence over the whole area indicates confidence and sense of power. One dispatch reports some loose talk, on the part of one or two Dominion officials, about attempted revolution and Soviets, and there are a few items in the news that warrant some such construction of the strike movement. It is to be noted that the Western Inter-Provincial Labor Conference, comprising all the craft unions of the provinces west of Ontario, have severed affiliation with the American Federation of Labor and combined into a body called the One Big Union, with a more progressive programme. In this they favor a system of government by representatives selected from the industries, demand amnesty for political prisoners and abolition of the censorship, declare their sympathy with the aims of the proletarian revolution in Russia and Germany, and propose a general strike on June 1 in case the Allied Governments persist in their interference with the realization of these purposes.

NOTHING is quite so steady and irresistible as the progress of woman suffrage. Seven days bring us the news of a favorable vote upon it in the French Chamber of Deputies, its adoption by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, and the overwhelming vote of 304 to 89 in the House of Representatives in Washington. The Senate alone hangs fire. But there, too, the omens are favorable and a test vote on Monday of this week shows that its passage is assured as soon as the Senate's procedure permits. Delayed it may be, but the end of the fight is at hand, and the credit will belong, not to a Democratic Senate, but to a Republican. That Pennsylvania should have yielded so easily is proof positive how strongly the current is sweeping, yet we anticipate a vigorous fight against ratification of the constitutional amendment. Its opponents will take heed of what happened in the prohibition campaign, and will doubtless concentrate their opposition in the Southern States. Yet ratification will come, of course. It would be as easy a task to stop the spheres in their courses as to prevent the coming of suffrage now that it is in sight even in France—perhaps in some ways the most conservative of nations.

THE Republican majority in Congress will perform a great service if it carries out its announced intention of pressing to prompt enactment legislation creating a national budget system. There is little understanding among the people at large of what a real budget system is, and the question is not one to attract great popular interest. Yet with the steady growth of Federal expenditures, and with the huge legacy of debt left by the war, few matters are of greater practical importance than that of placing on the President the responsibility for formulating a definite, coordinated work programme, figuring out its exact cost, and executing it. The present scattering of this responsibility among dozens of bureaus in the various Departments means inefficiency, waste, and log rolling on a huge scale. Bills providing for budget legislation have been introduced in both houses, and with the support of both parties and the approval of the President, a budget system seems assured.

SUBJECT to the approval of its stockholders, which will doubtless be forthcoming, the International Mercantile Marine Corporation formally agreed last week to part with all the ships flying the British flag in which it has an interest. The transaction involves eighty-five vessels of approximately 853,000 gross tons, and the consideration to be paid is stated to be in the neighborhood of $130,000,000. The negotiations leading up to this sale were unusually protracted, and were first started more than a year ago. Just as they were about to be consummated with a British syndicate, the Shipping Board after the conclusion of the armistice interposed its veto and announced that it would itself acquire all of the Mercantile Marine's tonnage under British registry. Owing to the refusal of the British Government to allow any British ships to pass under an alien flag, however, which objection our authorities ought to have foreseen, Chairman Hurley and his associates at the beginning of last month were forced to abandon their intention of taking over the merchant fleets of the Marine Corporation's affiliated British lines. This left the company free to close with the original British syndicate, which promptly renewed its first offer. Since the purchase price mentioned of $153 per gross ton cannot be deemed high on the basis of present tonnage values, it would seem as though the directors of the Mercantile Marine in agreeing to the terms proposed had been actuated as much by a desire to end an anomalous situation as by any other consideration. Although their American holding corporation was the sole owner of the White Star and other British lines, it could neither obtain legal title to its property nor transfer it as it saw fit. By the coming sale this unsatisfactory state of affairs will be ended and a possible bone of contention between the United States and Great Britain done away with.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Growing Revolt Against the Treaty

"WHY," writes an old reader, "has the *Nation* become so pessimistic? Can it see nothing good about the peace treaty?" Well, it can see this much good about the treaty—that its absurdities, injustices, inconsistencies, and wickednesses are beginning to put its makers upon the defensive and are everywhere creating a reaction and leading to increasingly vigorous protests. Thus, the conscience of England asserts itself again in a manifesto demanding alteration and reconsideration, signed by the Bishop of Oxford, Jerome K. Jerome, H. G. Wells, Lady Gilbert, John Masefield, Arthur Henderson, and "many eminent professors, authors, and others." England is seething with opposition, yet our press brings but little word of it. For instance, at a great mass meeting in Albert Hall last week addressed by Lord Parmoor, Earl Beauchamp, Commander Kenworthy, M. P., Robert Smillie, today the most powerful labor leader in Great Britain, Maude Royden, and others, resolutions were passed demanding a different peace treaty and a peace of reconciliation and the immediate relief of starving Europe. Next week a trade-union congress is to oppose the treaty. In Sweden and Norway, meetings are constantly being held to denounce the treaty and the blockade, and to give vent to the complete public disappointment in Mr. Wilson. In Switzerland, the feeling against the League of Nations is reported to be growing rapidly because of the peace. In France, the radicals are becoming steadily more and more bitter, as in England, where the radical and socialist press has absolutely turned away from Mr. Wilson as the betrayer of liberalism.

Here at home, there are many signs of growing dissatisfaction, primarily with the policy of secrecy in accordance with which the President who was for open covenants of peace refuses to give to the American Congress and to the American people the complete treaty which is safely reposing in the desk of the acting Secretary of State. These evidences of domestic dissatisfaction are becoming so numerous that it would be impossible to be pessimistic about the outlook if one would. Not that we expect the rejection of the treaty or its serious modification. Since the treaty will go into effect when signed by Germany and ratified by three nations, which may happen to mean three unscrupulous old men, it will undoubtedly become the basis for the grounding of arms. But the point is that the outlook for the world would have been dark indeed, if such a monstrous travesty of the Fourteen Points, such an indefensible continuance of the criminal order of the world which brought about the existing chaos, had gone without protest and without international indignation at the betrayal of the honor of the Allied nations by what the English authors and professors call "a breach of faith with a beaten enemy." If the moral conscience of the world had been found in this emergency to have been slain on the battlefields of France, then indeed there would have been ground for pessimism. That such is not the case, that men are beginning to speak out, to see that there is nothing in this pact but the seeds of future wars (as Henry Morgenthau and William C. Bullitt, whose ringing letter of resignation of his confidential position with the Peace Commission in Paris we print elsewhere, have just pointed out) gives ground for real cheer and profound encouragement. For these protests will not die out when the deed is done, but will grow in volume and would in themselves insure, in time, the collapse of the whole rotten treaty-structure.

That is already foreordained. What better proof of it could there be than the fact that in a single week we have reports of the heavy fighting when the Greeks were without previous notice made masters of Smyrna; that the United States, Great Britain, and France have had to move against their partner in guilt, Italy, for poaching and land-grabbing in Asia Minor during all of the hullabaloo over Fiume; that our beloved Polish Allies will neither cease from slaughtering Jews nor from warring on the Ukrainians contrary to the express commands of the three arbiters of the world? If other proof were needed it is afforded by the fact that mysterious "friends of the President" in Paris are beginning to appear in the news dispatches as representing that the President is himself quite dissatisfied with the treaty but that he had to yield to superior force, he who was ready to apply "force to the utmost, force without stint or limit" against the Germans. Equally significant is the defence of the treaty by its advocates here, who are insisting upon the horrible situation which will arise if all the other Allies make peace and we alone remain at war. They quite forget to point out that if Makino, Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Brockdorff-Rantzau sign, and our Senate should take six months in which to deliberate, this awful contingency would occur anyway. It will be nothing more horrifying than that these Allies of ours would have the opportunity to trade with our enemies some months before we Americans could.

For ourselves, we can see nothing terrifying in the situation which would ensue if our Senate should veto the whole treaty, as it ought to—not because of defects of the League of Nations, but on moral grounds, because the treaty as it stands violates our national honor and makes a mockery of every high-sounding phrase with which we went into the war. Congress could at any time by simple resolution declare the state of war at an end, and free us from the hundred-fold entanglements which the present document carries with it. Since we want no territorial gain whatsoever, and the moral requirements of the course we should pursue are clearly delineated by the Fourteen Points, we could speedily restore the *status quo ante* even if we were so wicked as to leave the question of Fiume and the Polish corridor to others to settle. Appeals not to leave the Allies in the lurch now move us not at all, any more than assertions that because of "commitments abroad"—usually unnamed—we must accept the League and the treaty, and trust to luck and to the unknown men who may be the managers of this bastard League of Nations to right the wrongs the treaty contains. We wish nothing to do with sophistry of this kind. There are but a few simple questions to be asked in connection with the treaty. Does it violate our national honor? Does it go directly contrary to the Fourteen Points? Does it give the slightest hope of a better and nobler world? Is it dictated to our enemies in a spirit of justice, humanity, and Christianity? For those who, like the English authors and teachers, answer no to the last two questions it is idle to talk of the consequences of refusal to sign. We place honor and humanity first, all the more readily because we cannot conceive that the state of affairs which rejection of the treaty would bring about could possibly be worse than that which will be the inevitable result of its adoption.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pogroms In Poland

REPORTS of wholesale massacres of Jews in Poland have at length gotten a tardy and imperfect publicity in this country, although the English papers have had a good deal to say about them for months. Our energetic young protégé among the new and free nations has apparently risen at such a rate to the conception of liberty, democracy, self-determination, and the rest, that it has already managed to make a notable record in the matter of slaughtering quite a large number of innocent and defenceless Jews. At Pinsk, on April 5, Polish soldiers surrounded the People's Building, where a general conference of coöperative societies was discussing plans for the distribution of flour; arrested all the members, escorted them carefully away, and shot them—shot them all, to the number of over fifty, and picked up an additional bag of thirty or forty on the way. These last were shot on sight, it seems, without any particular formality. Later in April, the Jewish quarter of a town in the government of Vilna was destroyed and several hundred Jews were killed; and on the 26th, the Jewish quarter of Warsaw was raided by the soldiery, and again the casualties mounted into the hundreds. The Polish military authorities "explained" the Pinsk affair as the result of an unfortunate mistake on the part of the local commandant, who had thought that the conference was a communist assembly. The grounds for this impression are not stated and are hard to conjecture; in fact, the lucidity, intelligence, and devotion to the principle of justice displayed by this local commandant remind one of the recent effort of Mr. Glass, our Secretary of the Treasury, in his explanation of the raid on the office of the New York *Call*—in other words, are quite what one would expect under the circumstances. The other massacres seem to go as they lie, as our slang is, except for the promise of the Polish soldiers at Pinsk, reported by the *Manchester Guardian*, that they "would make things still hotter for the Jews."

The Committee for Relief of Jewish War Sufferers, a most responsible organization, was cabled by its agents in Warsaw on May 25 that "pogroms took place recently in Kalisch, Dombrowo, Chmelnik, Pinchow, Stupnik, Wielun, Bust, and other parts of Poland. . . . on March 12, Polish soldiers pierced the bodies of inoffensive children in Dombrowo . . . officers of the Polish army shot at a crowd. Shops were invaded and robbed and many persons were injured. . . . in Kosnitz the Poles forced a Jew to kneel down and kiss Polish ground until exhausted. . . . On the plea that they are searching for hidden weapons, Polish gendarmes invade respectable Jewish homes and rob them of all portable belongings." The cablegram does not scruple to declare explicitly that "The Polish authorities in small towns are instigators of these pogroms." There seems no possible doubt of the situation, and no doubt about the propriety of holding the Polish Government responsible for it.

Meanwhile the major representatives of liberty, democracy, and self-determination, assembled at Paris, appear uninterested. Laying their course strictly by the line of the Larger Good, they do not see their way to offer their vigorous young associate a word of caution lest its mode of vindicating our great new international principles might be misunderstood or even arouse some vague resentment, especially in the United States. For the most part, they seem to have depended on the censorship and the discrimination of the press, to break the news as gently as possible; and have, by the implication of silence, at least, consented to a gala open season on Jews, not only in Poland but in Rumania also, and in other parts of Eastern Europe under Allied control. An enormous mass-meeting, however, one of the largest ever seen in New York, was held in Madison Square Garden on May 22, and Messrs. Elkus, Schiff, Charles E. Hughes, and other speakers, expressed sentiments of dissatisfaction which were cabled to President Wilson in the form of a resolution. These will not bring the poor Jews back to life, unhappily; perhaps they will not go very far to save other victims of our associate Government's cruelty and cupidity. Still, it was all that could be done and highly creditable to our civilization, as well as expressive of its fundamental instinct.

For really, this kind of thing is exasperating to Americans. We have sins of our own to answer for, and cast the first stone with searchings of heart. We lynch, and life is held cheap. Yet for some reason, perhaps because we have not been a militarist nation long enough to get used to it, we rather reluct at organized wholesale massacre, especially of unarmed, helpless persons, or of women and children. There is a survival of the old frontier etiquette, under which a weaponless man was not fair prey. It was the killing of women, children, and helpless men that most of all set us against the German Government. We could not bear the thought of their being trodden, unconsidered, into the path of German world-domination. Neither, if we knew it, could we bear the thought of Jewish, German, Russian, *any* innocent men, women, and children being trodden, just as helpless and just as unconsidered, into the path of Allied world-domination.

But of these there is no one to tell us; no one to arouse our sentiments of pity for them with irruptions of fine indignation; no Mr. Creel, no Bureau of Public Information, no posters, no moving-pictures, or four-minute men speaking in the theatres and on the streets. No, for the sufferings of these poor people, the murdered Jews of Poland, the women and children of Russia and Germany who have been murdered by the slow death of the blockade—the blockade which even now our papers blithely say will be "clamped on again" in case Germany refuses to sign the treaty—their sufferings are but incidental to the working out of *our* plan of world-domination, which of course is a very just and beneficent plan and absolutely prerequisite to the fulness of the Larger Good; for is it not Ours?

God have mercy on them, even though we may not. The miserable part of it is that these people never did us any harm or wished us any. Their only rôle has been that of inarticulate suffering from the inhumanity and cruelty of their own Governments first, and now from ours. It is probably a good thing that they are far away out of sight, because if we knew much about them we should make such a fuss that no doubt the Larger Good would be obstructed. Those who have been among them come back and report that sometimes, indeed, it almost seemed that the Larger Good was coming a little high. Far enough away they are, however, as far out of humanity's reach as were ever the Belgian and French deportees, or any Flemish community that lay in the hollow of von Bissing's hand. So, fortunately, we are able to forget them, to raise our minds above them, and if we ever do experience a qualm of uneasiness about them, to allay it by contemplation of our progress towards the Larger Good.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peace and the Poets

To the poetaster, who must find his inspiration in external events and conventional emotions rather than in the world of his own spirit, war is the greatest of boons. Certainly he is never so active or so happy as when he is filling the public ear with his gramophone variations on the martial theme. But the true Muse is notoriously ill at ease amid the clash of arms. And in the days immediately following war she becomes even more constrained and inarticulate. Probably the poets, like the rest of us, are too benumbed by the shock of tremendous happenings to find easy or eloquent voice for their emotions. They cannot, at any rate, write to order: it is not for them to extol war and vilify peace today, and tomorrow reverse the process, in compliance with popular or official demand. Perhaps, after all, it is chiefly because war and peace so seldom spring from a spontaneous national impulse, because they are so often merely the artificial handiwork of politicians, that they constitute impossible or repellent themes for the true poet. Even at the best, the deeper moral values involved are too likely to be inextricably confused for him who probes beneath surface appearances, as the poet must. And so in such crises he falls silent, for the most part, and the field is given over to the bardling and the official laureate. Or if he speaks out, the resulting product is invariably the least enduring of his work in the appraisal of after years.

The meagreness and poverty of English poetry in celebration of peace are strikingly shown in a recent anthology called "The Poetry of Peace," compiled by R. M. Leonard. Ranging over the entire field "from the fall of Lucifer to the fall of Kruger," Mr. Leonard is able to offer us only a thin volume of little more than a hundred pages, containing some eighty selections. And even so, he has had to include a good many things that have at best only a tenuous relation to the subject of his anthology. Of the rest, there is little in the way of truly inspired verse. Some of it, indeed—as for instance, Robert Bridges's ode on the conclusion of the Boer War, a piece as wooden in construction as it is dubious in sentiment—might well qualify for that Anthology of Worst Poetry which Mr. Leonard mentions in his preface. There are a hundred single lines in Wordsworth any one of which is worth the whole of his two long odes on peace written in 1815 and 1816. Whittier, to whom is given more space than any other poet in the book, comes off rather better than most of the others in the matter of quality also. Walt Whitman is adequately represented, and Lowell and Longfellow fare nearly as well. Indeed, without the Americans Mr. Leonard could scarcely have made a respectable showing.

But although this compilation brings with it few authentic echoes from Parnassus, it offers much of curious interest in connection with events of today. One frequently comes upon lines and passages, occasionally entire poems, that might have been written with those events in mind. Take as an example the greater part of Elizabeth Waterhouse's "The Peace, 1871"—how aptly it voices for today, as for the time in which it was written, the frustrate hopes of a world sick for peace!

> As one should tell us in the dim thick night—
> "Behold the dawn!" and we looked forth to see
> The whole wide East grow golden silently
> With joy of coming light,
> And saw instead a line of cloudy flame
> And lightning flashes leaping swift therethrough,
> And heard the muffled thunder-pulse and knew
> The storm, not morning, came.
>
> So is it when each wiry nerve today
> Of eager Europe thrills with that sweet word,
> Sweet yet so false, soon as its sound is heard
> Its promise dies away.

Scarcely less pertinent to the present situation, in their general indictment, are Whittier's two long poems, "The Peace Convention at Brussels" (1848) and "The Peace of Europe" (1852)—the latter with its rebuke to "the lying prophets of our day" who, then as now, set up the official fiction of "peace" and "order" restored to the Continent by "victory":

> Go lay to earth a listening ear;
> The tramp of measured marches hear;
> The rolling of the cannon's wheel,
> The shotted musket's murderous peal,
> The night alarm, the sentry's call,
> The quick-eared spy in hut and hall!
> From Polar sea and tropic fen
> The dying groans of exiled men!
> The bolted cell, the galley's chains,
> The scaffold smoking with its stains!
> Order, the hush of brooding slaves!
> Peace, in the dungeon-vaults and graves!

Even "Paradise Lost," has some good contemporary touches—as, for instance, this summary of the Paris Conference:

> Grey-headed men and grave, with warriors mixed,
> Assemble, and harangues are heard; but soon
> In factious opposition, till at last
> Of middle age one rising, eminent
> In wise deport, spake much of right and wrong,
> Of justice, of religion, truth, and peace,
> And judgment from above.

Our eloquent moralist at Paris has not yet been snatched up in a cloud, as was Milton's orator, but that expedient may still be found necessary. Whether it be a far cry from the Stygian regions to Versailles depends, perhaps, upon one's point of view; yet one might as readily imagine the accents of the German peace delegates as of Beelzebub speaking in these lines:

> War hath determined us and foiled with loss
> Irreparable; . . . for what peace will be given
> To us enslaved, but custody severe,
> And stripes, and arbitrary punishment
> Inflicted? and what peace can we return,
> But, to our power, hostility and hate,
> Untamed reluctance, and revenge, though slow,
> Yet ever plotting how the Conqueror least
> May reap his conquest, and may least rejoice
> In doing what we most in suffering feel?

Although the Germans, with the rest of us, may have to accept for the moment the "naked, poor, and mangled peace" which the politicians have forced upon us, it is not the Germans only who will say with Shakespeare's Mowbray:

> There is a thing within my bosom tells me
> That no conditions of our peace can stand.

And the prayer voiced by Mrs. Browning a half century ago must still arise from the suffering peoples of earth:

> O Lord of Peace, who art Lord of Righteousness,
> Constrain the anguished worlds from sin and grief,
> Pierce them with conscience, purge them with redress,
> And give us peace which is no counterfeit!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Curious Fancy

IN the mediæval treatise entitled "Antidotarius Animae" —it was in the library discovered by our indefatigable master Alcofribas, and catalogued by him in his book of the Heroic Deeds and Prowesses of Pantagruel—there is propounded a strange theory. It appears that the people of a certain country had built a splendid palace, flawless in its architecture and perfect in its appointments, to house an uncommonly worthless and oppressive king. The author of the treatise set himself to explain this inconsistency, to solve the problem of why the intelligence that was capable of building that palace was not capable of preventing its being put to such a bad use. He could only account for it on the assumption that each of the Divine attributes finds a special expression on some one of the celestial bodies; and that while the special expression of God's love, justice, mercy, and so forth, appeared in the order prevailing in other planets, the special expression of His humor appeared in human civilization here on earth. The old monk, in his quaint anthropomorphism, with no taint of irreverence but quite in the spirit of Genesis, draws, on the whole, a very refreshing picture of the Deity as sometimes tiring of the busy task (*multiplex occupatio*) of perpetually contemplating his own more august attributes, and turning aside to divert himself with the fantastic inconsistencies that He had for this express purpose implanted in the human race. The writer found no trouble in squaring this theory with the doctrine of divine goodness and justice. In the scope of eternity, our life here is insignificant; therefore, even the worst and most dolorous experience is relatively only the bad quarter of an hour that one spends when one is the butt of a wise and loving father's kindly jest.

We get the foregoing from a friend who knows Latin better than we do and may be hoaxing us; so we do not plume ourselves too much on rushing into print with the discovery. The idea, however, is comforting and tends to temper the impatience of the reformer with a more benign and shrewder reason. Perhaps some notion of the sort was in the mind of Emerson when he imagined the stars looking down upon the avatar of an intractible and obstreperous righteousness, and inquiring, Why so hot, little man? The problem, certainly, is a facer; and every step in human progress seems to push it harder and harder upon one's attention. Here is a race with ability enough to invent the alphabet, for instance, and yet it reads newspapers; with a sense of beauty and fitness sufficient to erect the Capitol at Washington, and yet fills it with politicians; with sufficient analytic and reflective power to determine the cause of involuntary poverty, but not enough sense to abolish it; with an inventive faculty equal to swimming the seas and clearing the air, and yet it builds battleships and Zeppelins. All wonderful material on which to feed the sense of humor and we are a little too apt, especially if we have the turn for reform, to survey it with the dourness of these most depressing persons who have to have a joke diagrammed for them. Perhaps if the old monk were living now, he would say that the increasing urgency of the problem is simply the mode of Divine insistence on our seeing the point; and that He insists because we cannot profit by this special phase of our cosmic experience until we become aware that the joke is on us, and bring our sense of humor into a saving coöperation with His own.

Clearing the Air

THE resignation, reported last week, of nine members of the American Peace Commission, has received little publicity and less editorial comment, though it would appear to be as significant a subject for disinterested rumination in the sanctum as any that has come over the wires in some time. Some of the later dispatches are apparently intended to soften the force of the first impression that the members resigned by way of protest against the iniquitous terms of the treaty. Naturally, all the forces of publicity at command of the Government would be used to minimize the effect of action of this kind, and the United Press accordingly deserves the best thanks of all American citizens for having placed us in possession of a letter which Mr. William C. Bullitt, one of the nine disaffected members, wrote to President Wilson, giving the reasons for his resignation.

We are glad to assist in making this document a matter of public record. The time has passed, apparently, for taking the peace treaty on faith. Along with the process of disillusionment there goes an increasing interest in fixing the responsibility for what is beginning to be felt and resented as a deception of first-class magnitude. Mr. Bullitt's letter meets this interest; it does the public the service of clarifying and precipitating in plain words, a vague and perhaps unreasoned, but wholly sound, sense of shabbiness and treachery. We reproduce it directly from the United Press report, as follows:

Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States:

SIR: I have submitted to the Secretary of State my resignation as assistant in the Department of State and attaché to the American commission to negotiate peace. I am one of the millions who trusted implicitly in your leadership and believed you would take nothing less than "a permanent peace based on unselfish, unbiased justice." But the Government has consented now to deliver the suffering peoples of the world to new oppressions, subjections and dismemberments—a new century of war.

I can convince myself no longer that effective labor for a "new world order" is possible as a servant of this Government. Russia, the "acid test of good will" for me, as for you, has not ever been understood. Unjust decisions regarding Shantung, Tyrol, Thrace, Hungary, East Prussia, Danzig, and the Saar Valley and abandonment of the principle of freedom of the seas make new international conflicts certain.

It is my conviction the present League of Nations will be powerless to prevent these wars, and the United States will be involved in them by obligations undertaken through the covenant of the League and in a special understanding with France. Therefore, the duty of the Government of the United States to its own people and to mankind is to refuse to sign this unjust treaty; refuse to guarantee its settlements by entering the League of Nations, and refuse to entangle the United States further by an understanding with France.

That you persistently opposed most of the unjust settlements; that you accepted them only under great pressure is well known. Nevertheless it is my conviction that if you had made your fight in the open instead of behind closed doors you would have carried with you the public opinion of the world, which was yours; you would have been able to resist the pressure and might have established the "new international order, based upon broad universal principles of right and justice" of which you used to speak.

I am sorry you did not fight our fight to a finish and that you had so little faith in the millions of men like myself in every nation who had faith in you.

WILLIAM C. BULLITT

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Opening of Congress

By LINCOLN COLCORD

TO one who has seen the inadequacy and failure of Congress during the war period, the utter stagnation of the legislative branch of government, and the consequent growth of a jealous and arbitrary bureaucracy in the executive field, the new Congress which has just assembled presents many hopeful signs. There is an atmosphere of freedom and activity at the Capitol which breathes of health, sanity, and a return to the normal consciousness of our political processes. For two years Congress has lived and spoken under the shadow of a war psychology warped and perverted into the channels of emotionalism by an intellectually dishonest Administration. The result has been pathetic and disheartening. Congress, in the very nature of its being, is not of a calibre to rise above such an attack on the part of the Executive. Few men at the Capitol dared speak their minds or follow their native thoughts and impulses. Fewer still were able to assemble the facts which alone could support an independent argument. Congress during the war was like a great, good-natured fat man, trembling with apprehension, puffing with loyalty, and at times spluttering with rage and chagrin. But now the enchantment has been broken, and Congress has come out from under the shadow. Of this outstanding fact there can be absolutely no doubt. It is the dominating feature of the opening of the session. Never again will Woodrow Wilson usurp the legislative function of government and terrorize the legislature as he has done for the past two years. Hereafter he will meet with that definite opposition the lack of which has been the curse of his Administration during the war. Whatever its intellectual calibre, Congress will at least be natural once more, and speak its unintimidated mind.

I have never been among those who dismiss Congress with a wave of the hand and a supercilious sneer. In fact, I have always liked Congress whole-heartedly. It is a good American body. It is fairly representative of the American middle class. A President has no excuse for quarreling with Congress, much less for scorning it. If he would show a fitting interest in its peculiarities, Congress would meet him half way at any time. I mean to say that Congress is straightforwardly human; if a man is interested in the truths of human nature he will find them "on the Hill." And when I listen to the arguments of intellectuals and experts as to the shortcomings of Congress, I cannot but remember that after all there are more things than theory and efficiency in the philosophy of democracy. There are, for instance, certain valuable traditions of self-government, certain principles of decentralization and local control, and certain matters concerning the fundamental rights of man. These things are best known to homely minds. An intellectual Administration has imposed upon the country a narrow Bourbon bureaucracy, and has led us far astray from the true principles of Americanism. Even while the President scoffed at it, there was more liberalism in Congress than in his own Administration. In spite of the passage by Congress of the Espionage Law, dictated and brought about by the policy of the Executive, the rights of the people during the war were better protected in Congress than in the White House. These are lessons we must strive to understand.

So far, I seem to be writing like a good Republican; but it is not so much because Congress has changed its party complexion that I am hopeful of it. It is chiefly because the terrible oppression of war is over, and because the illusion of President Wilson's idealism has been finally and conclusively dissipated by no other than himself. The freedom of expression among Senators and Congressmen is startling; and no less startling, to one who for a long time has heard little opinion between outright jingoism and intense radicalism, is the clearness of view which Congress seems to have regarding the issues of the war. I would not claim that Congress fully grasped these issues, for I do not believe that as a body it understands the present economic and industrial state of the world. But I frankly have been amazed to hear what I have heard since I came to Washington. The President's sudden fall from grace, his outright surrender to the forces of reaction and imperialism, has brought about a curious shift of all the forces; and in the atmosphere of the new Congress there unquestionably exists something which may be interpreted as a distinct tone of liberalism. I have heard many a Senator this week denounce the peace treaty, not on a basis of partisanship and not from the point of view of a bloodthirsty jingo, but on the score of its inherent injustice, of its palpable wrong against the German people and against humanity. The President simply has gone too far. He has rolled too big a pill of imperialism for Congress to swallow. The game is too wide open, the tactics are too obviously inconsistent; and Congress, with a simple mind, if you will, but with a certain native honesty of heart and purpose, is now in the process of revolt. It vaguely feels the necessity of rescuing the ideals of America from the pit into which President Wilson has thrown them. Never was a more unexpected, formless, absurd, but nevertheless real, situation.

I would not have it believed that I am reflecting the views only of radical Senators and Congressmen. The fact that interests me profoundly in the situation is to find that certain reactionaries, certain members of the Republican Old Guard, are measurably shocked at the outrightness of the imperialism that has transpired in Paris and appalled at the cynical ruthlessness of the peace treaty. Men of this type speak openly of the Shantung injustice, of the criminal folly of the economic provisions of the treaty, and of the disastrous shortsightedness of its territorial provisions. They say that ten new wars have been created in the attempted settlement of the Great War. And when it comes to the League of Nations, there is a clearer conception of the significance of the present covenant than I had expected to find among such men. One hears it argued that the present machinery of the League of Nations is nothing but a superimposed bureaucracy, that it contains no provision for the representation of peoples as opposed to that of Governments, that it does not look to the changing of existing law by international legislation, and similar contentions which have heretofore been supposed to be the views exclusively of liberals. The people of America, and especially the radicals, would be astonished to know what Senator

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is who is spreading the authentic information among his friends that the present League of Nations covenant derives its chief support from the international banking group in Paris; that this group seized upon it early in the negotiations, recognizing that it would be much easier for them to deal with a small appointive bureaucracy than with peoples and nations at large; that they quickly saw, in short, that President Wilson had come to them with an undreamed-of boon, and all with the halo of idealism about its head. I have heard many fists banged on tables this week, and many times the explosive denunciation: "This League of Nations is the most dangerous piece of machinery in the interests of financial imperialism that the world ever saw!"

Perhaps I am optimistic; it is a relief to indulge the mood once more. I am under no illusions as to the liberalism of the reactionary Republican; but even a reactionary Republican is more liberal than a Bourbon Democrat, and more liberal, I have come to believe, than a man who preaches liberalism and never keeps his word. There is a certain virtue in dealing with facts; and the Bourbon régime of the past two years has led our policies so far astray from facts that a return to a fact basis, even for the purposes of reaction, would today give us a net result of liberalism. I almost believe that there is hope in the new Congress for a better understanding of the Russian problem, and that the splendid campaign for facts and the truth waged single-handed by Senator Hiram Johnson in the last session may now begin to bear fruit. And I do sincerely believe that as between the electorates of the two parties, there is a sounder basis for liberalism in that of the Republican party.

The test, so far as the new Congress is concerned, will come about very shortly, over the matter of a peace-time Espionage Law. A bill for a drastic law, for a law permanently destroying the fundamental rights of man in America, is about to be introduced as a result of the notorious investigation of Bolshevism by the Overman Committee at the close of the last session. The cry of Bolshevism will be raised anew, Senator King will deliver a tirade about the nationalization of women and the abolition of God in Russia, Senator Overman will hold up before the affrighted gaze of the Senate one of the bombs recently placed in the mails, and every emotional appeal will be made as justification for the raid upon our traditional and constitutional liberties. Radical Senators have told me that the bill will pass by a large majority. Somehow, I do not believe it. I do not believe the country wants it. I have more faith in the sanity of America and in the horse-sense of the new Congress, than to credit the idea that we will forsake our inborn and fundamental Americanism for the Prussianism which we have just helped to overthrow.

The Espionage bill will be a test, as well, of a political issue within the Congress which bids fair to travel far before it is through. Shall the Progressive *bloc* in the Senate gain a real influence over the policies of the Republican party, or shall the Old Guard lead the party to reactionary ground? The Progressive Senators, Johnson, France, LaFollette, and others, will of course fight the Espionage bill tooth and nail. Senator France already has introduced a bill calling for the repeal of the present Espionage Law, and has received the promise that it will be reported out of committee. These men know that they cannot remain loyal to a party which does not believe in freedom of speech. They know that, if a peace-time Espionage Law be written by a Republican Congress, the formation of a third political party in America becomes inevitable. While they discuss these matters (somewhat gloomily, for they are not among the optimists), they congratulate the forces in the country which already are blazing the way for a third-party movement, and speak approvingly and understandingly of the British Labor party and the industrial forces in Great Britain which are bringing about orderly and fundamental changes there.

In fact, the Progressive *bloc* in the Senate holds all the hope of leadership in the new situation. The men who make up this *bloc* are of a special stamp; they are the outright and sincere men of the Senate, the truth-lovers and truth-speakers. They are the only men in the Senate with radical views and sympathies, who have a realizing sense of the war's imponderable economic factors, and who understand what is the matter with the world. They know that the issues of reconstruction are radical issues, and that if they are not met by political action they will be met, sooner or later, by economic action. They are going to put up a fight to make the Republican party the liberal party of the future. But it is hard to foretell how much they will accomplish, or how vigorously, after all, they will conduct their campaign. They came to office through our binding political machinery, and it is fair to assume that in the last analysis they are still tied down. Only a few of them—perhaps but one or two—possess that final sense of the imminence of change and the necessity for action which lends faith to desire, and makes it possible for a true leader to lift himself by his bootstraps.

The Progressive *bloc* obviously needs a real and constructive issue on which to test its strength. The Penrose fight over the chairmanship of the Finance Committee is merely a flash in the political pan. The Espionage bill will furnish an issue in integrity, but not in constructive legislation. The real test of sustained ability will unquestionably come over the problem of what to do with the railways. If the Progressive *bloc* fails to adopt an adequate programme for the solution of this problem, it will have demonstrated its inability to march with the times.

As for the great bulk of Congress, there can be no denying its essential inadequacy in terms of the real world-problem. I have written encouragingly because I believe that the first duty of America is to attend to her lost liberties, and because I believe that in some way the new Congress will rescue those liberties. Beyond that, we face a blank. The spectacle in Washington is that of a purely political body assembling to legislate reconstruction for a country whose ills are almost purely economic and industrial. The new Congress certainly has scant comprehension either of the existence or of the potentialities of those ills. Labor will have no voice in its deliberations. A body largely made up of lawyers and local politicians will be called upon to debate and solve the deepest economic problems in the history of the land. The Congress quite definitely is a class Congress, and in the present situation its legislation will deal largely with the class which it does not represent. This, of course, has been true of any Congress since the substantial growth of industrialism; but today the whole industrial movement has been suddenly and violently precipitated by the war. Congress does not know that it has been precipitated, and will not understand the successive manifestations of the occurrence. The world abroad is on the threshold of drastic social change; Congress does not know it,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but American labor knows it. All that Congress thinks of in the industrial field is the menace of Bolshevism and the maintenance of the divine rights of privilege. Its conception of the actual motive forces in its own country is both vague and unsound. It lives in a world of its own, a somewhat fictitious world, deriving its information from letters and contacts that tend to exaggerate the artificial and disparage the real. What hope for constructive legislation can rest with such a body? The only hope is that the industrial situation of the country has enough resilience to hold until economic change can be reflected in our political processes.

One could easily multiply instances forecasting the inability of the new Congress to grasp the necessity for radical economic action. Senator after Senator will tell you that America is not confronted with the same problems which convulse Europe today, that unemployment has now passed the peak and is rapidly decreasing, that American labor is loyal and sensible, and that, in short, we have nothing to bother about in the industrial field. "There aren't any plans," I was told by a prominent Senator. "We are waiting for things to develop a little, before we go at them. The railroad problem is bound to be the dominating issue of the session—but everything takes time." "Will the railroads go back to the former owners?" I asked. "They must," he answered. "They must—but I don't see how they can." The answer is typical of the Congressional state of mind.

What will Congress do? Beyond the immediate future and the routine legislation, it is almost impossible to say. I think that if Germany signs, the Senate will ratify the peace treaty, including the provisions for a League of Nations. There will be a terrific smoke, and some fire behind it, but in the end the treaty will be ratified. The situation is frantically confusing; for it is not, as many think, that all of the Old Guard oppose the treaty because it is too lenient to Germany. Wilson's deflection to the right has sadly mixed the lines. And if Germany signs, it will mean that the international banking forces in Paris have been able to set the steam roller going, and the American business system will soon hear of it—and on almost the same day the Senate will be likely to get the news.

There is much loose talk by lesser Republicans of a complete and downright investigation of the conduct of the war. I seriously doubt if any such investigation is carried forward. Republican leaders feel that it would not be good tactics. The country, they believe, has silently but none the less surely lost confidence in the efficiency of the Administration. To open the question might be dangerous. Some things were done fairly well—and the talents of the Administration in the realm of publicity have already been demonstrated. Furthermore, it lies in the back of every Republican's head that, since the business forces of the country are largely Republican, and since those are the forces which largely have profited out of the inefficiency of the Administration, a real investigation of that inefficiency might tread on toes in unexpected quarters and raise a howl. In fact, it is a situation which had better be left alone.

As for the Democrats, they maintain their partisan loyalty, but it is not hard to see that they are down-in-the-mouth. They know now that the President has led the party to disaster. He has committed that most nearly fatal of all errors—he has forsaken his moral issues. The ratification of the peace treaty will be a short-lived triumph. Everyone concedes that the Republican Party will win hands-down in next year's elections. The authentic story is being openly passed of how the President committed his first great error last fall, when he commanded the country to vote the Democratic ticket. Secretary Burleson fathered the suggestion, and placed it before the President with the support of Secretary Tumulty. Secretary McAdoo got wind of it, and opposed the idea forcibly. The advice of Senator Hitchcock was sought; he aligned himself with Secretary McAdoo in opposition. The President finally decided to act on the original suggestion. Unfortunately, Colonel House was abroad; he would not have permitted such a tactical error. The President, of course, blamed Mr. Burleson; there is a tale, which lacks confirmation, of the first Cabinet meeting after the event. At any rate Mr. Burleson is slated by the Democratic National Committee to leave the Cabinet as soon as President Wilson returns, and with him go Secretaries Houston and Redfield.

The new Congress is healthier than the old; it is fairly representative of middle-class opinion in America; it presents a few hopeful signs. If there is a single great man in it, it offers him an unprecedented opportunity. Congress must be lifted out of itself and into a new plane to be able to meet the conditions which it inevitably must face. Lacking the leadership of a great man and of a constructive policy, it will sink into reaction and fail the nation at its most critical pass. It rests with the courage and vision of a small group to disprove the prophecy of Congressman Mondell, the Republican leader of the House, a jingo of the first water. Said Mr. Mondell proudly, on the opening day of Congress: "The era of reconstruction and the return of old policies has arrived." If such is to be the dispensation, the country had better look out for squalls.

A Complacent Foundation

By JOSEPH JASTROW

TO the Handbook recording with proper expressions of gratitude the benefactions of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, Mr. Pritchett, as president of the Carnegie Foundation, contributes an account of the dozen years' activity of his responsible misguidance of this potent educational institution. He writes with a measure of complacent self-approval which, under the circumstances that actually surround the unfortunate history of his stewardship, may be pronounced superb. The complete change of front which the Foundation has undergone is presented as a deliberate improvement under philanthropic motive, supported by study and experience, and as innocent of pressure and protest as of necessity. Every suggestion of storm and stress, of veering and tacking to wind and weather, is eliminated from the log of the voyage which is set down in optimistic encomium.

In citing the paragraph recording the deed of gift, Mr. Pritchett is careful to omit the concluding sentence, retained of course in the legal document: "Expert calculation shows that the revenue [of the original gift of ten million dollars] will be ample for the purpose" (of providing pensions for the teachers in the higher institutions of the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland). We are still to be informed as to the authorship of this "expert calculation," which is wide of the mark by error, not of a million or two, or of tens of millions, but of a hundred millions, at least. To the frequent protesting indications of this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

egregious error, the Foundation for many years turned a deaf ear. An important provision of the deed of gift, showing the wisdom of Mr. Carnegie, provided that each institution participating in the fund should cast one vote for each trustee to be elected. That provision, if retained, might have prevented the worst of the misfortunes. It was eliminated from the charter.

Thus securely entrenched as a self-perpetuating board of university presidents, a board on which no member of the profession for whose benefit the fund exists has been able to gain representation, the trustees were free to interpret the conventional clause reserving the right to make such changes as circumstances may indicate, as giving them a free hand for repudiating obligations and posing necessities as virtues. When in the course of some eight or nine years the glaring fact could no longer be concealed that the Foundation faced bankruptcy if it construed its obligations scrupulously, the remedy was found by abandoning one half, and that the more important half, of the benefits offered, and originally defended as the wisest method of advancing the cause of the teacher. Commenting upon this at the time, the *Nation* remarked: "The homely obligation of fulfilling in a reasonable measure substantial expectations that have been raised by one's own declared intentions is a duty antecedent even to the high purposes to which the Carnegie Foundation is dedicated." The defence offered "betrays a misty notion of the nature of moral obligations."

But that abandonment simply sent the wolf from one door to another. The fund had been increased to sixteen million dollars, and ten State universities were in time added to the list of benefited institutions. Obviously the entire scheme was incapable of accomplishment on the plan originally adopted, as was evident from the outset. There was no reason, however, why the Foundation should not have required a partial participation by the benefiting institutions and by the benefited professor, and so have paved the way for a sound, permanent scheme for which the fund, increased from time to time from the accumulations of the Carnegie Corporation, might serve as a magnanimous subsidy. The subsidy could have been offered to institutions provided they were ready to establish for themselves a retiring system satisfactory to the Foundation. All such measures failed to secure consideration or adoption.

A few years ago Mr. Pritchett providentially discovered a new social philosophy, which held that a free pension was demoralizing; and he cited shocking examples of professors who had accepted what they were told was theirs by right of service, and retired before they were worn to a frazzle—when they were not even adequately impoverished or disabled, indeed. From this disappointment the sensitive conscience of Mr. Pritchett seems never to have completely rallied. He made an equally remarkable economic discovery, namely, that if one can succeed in getting some one else to pay one-third of one's bills, and another some one else to pay yet another third, one can do as much with the remaining third as though one had all the funds oneself; and this method of meeting one's obligations was actually shown by said "social philosophy" to be more uplifting and less demoralizing for the unworthy recipients than if the promises made to them had been kept. So the Foundation decided to found an insurance and annuity company which would be self-supporting, and thus relieve the Foundation of its vexed problem. That this was substituting a small thing paid for by others for a great benefaction supplementing what professors might do for themselves, was not even hinted. There remained the accrued liabilities of the original scheme. Under the strongest protests against the proposed method of meeting these obligations (of which the account says absolutely nothing, and which in the absence of protest would have been carried), another method was at length acted upon and a considerable increase of funds was obtained from the Carnegie Corporation.

This saving from the wreckage is due in large measure to the American Association of University Professors. In a spirit of coöperation and compromise, the Association gave its approval to a programme for meeting equitably (so far as the funds permitted) the accrued obligations; when to its astonishment the proposals upon which its approval was based were withdrawn and quite another scheme was substituted, while yet the indorsement was implied as still holding. As the insurance and annuity scheme was approved conditionally upon the equitable adjustment of accrued liabilities, the Association was compelled to withhold its approval of the entire programme, and so advised its members. Yet, despite all this, Mr. Pritchett has the amazing effrontery to present this scheme as a "solution" in these strange words:

> In a word, the conditions have been established under which the ambitious and high-minded man entering the profession of teacher may, within his reasonable ability to pay, protect himself and his family, and may do this with full consciousness of manly independence, of financial security, and of freedom in his profession. By such a process as that described, the problem that Mr. Carnegie set before his trustees has been brought to a solution.

Of the fact that a canvass was taken among the professors (as noted in the *Nation* of February 1, 1919), and that all but a negligible percentage voted against the proposed scheme, there is no mention. Of the fact that private insurance companies have offered to parallel the benefits (not identically but quite as favorably) at about the same cost, there is no mention. That university faculties in all parts of the country have examined the plan most carefully through proper committees, and with few (if any) exceptions have reported (or presumably will report) against the plan as effecting too trifling a benefit, or one which they could readily establish for themselves and under a more acceptable control, there is no mention. That the committee of the Association of University Professors has reported adversely upon the project unless important changes are made, there is no mention. The illustrious solution so satisfactory to Mr. Pritchett has only the single lack that no one cares to accept it, not even the "ambitious and high-minded man" whom Mr. Pritchett has now discovered in the profession, after finding the same profession full of disgruntled and demoralized and self-seeking individuals actually counting upon the realization of benefits promised by the Carnegie Foundation.

If Mr. Pritchett will read Mr. Dooley's account of the Pullman Car as it appears to the president of the Pullman Company, and as it appears to Mr. Dooley as a passenger in said car, he will find that his technique has been anticipated. But unfortunately banter is not the spirit in which so important a trust can be considered; it affects too seriously a part of the community important in weight though not in numbers. It is equally sad to find so responsible a group of men as the trustees of the Foundation persuaded

LIBRARY
LICENSED TO ... ONG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to follow so dubious a leadership; one suspects that annual junkets to New York are not conducive to sober consideration of equities and educational interests; nor are university presidents alone quite the proper representatives of academic interests. Yet one must be careful to distinguish between the responsibility of those members who were in office when the disastrous decisions were taken and those who were not; and must also remember that ineffective protests may have been made within the Board.

That Mr. Pritchett's complacency is not wholly unruffled, none the less, appears between the lines and below the words of his eulogy of his achievements. According to Freud, there is a subliminal that shapes our words, much choose them as we will. In the defence-psychology of this *apologia pro vita mea* there is the clue to the sugar-coated suspicion of guilt, and there is that protesting too much which the Freudians call over-determination. "As honest and conscientious Trustees, they have sought to face resolutely"; "there was only one thing that right-minded and courageous men could do under such circumstances"; "the Trustees of the Foundation have sought honestly and sincerely to apprehend"—these adjectives point to pin-pricks of doubt. Men exercising such qualities by inevitable expression of their nature do not speak of their own actions in such terms. They do not do so because they have no need of that type of defence; their records depend upon actions and the worth of their policies.

So far as Mr. Carnegie is concerned, there should be the most cordial and unreserved commendation of his benefactions; men benefiting by such gifts may express a manly personal gratitude. But to use the personality of the donor, whom men are pleased to honor, as a cloak to conceal shortcomings of administration, is questionable. To say that in Mr. Carnegie's judgment "these changes are changes in method only, whose only object is to serve in a deeper and larger way the great purpose for which the Foundation came into being" is once more to betray by a Freudian mechanism of transfer the admission that the changes are in the nature of abandonments and repudiations, forsaking, for lack of funds, "deeper and larger" purposes. One great benefit has arisen from the management of the Foundation: it has aroused such widespread opposition among the professors as to awaken a desirable class consciousness and a realization of the seriousness of the Foundation's menace to their interests when it is in alien and unsympathetic hands. In so far the Foundation has really advanced the cause of teaching; though such profit is not mentioned among the assets of its twelve years' career. In the Freudian technique, this device is called suppression; it is equally familiar in questionable argumentative procedures. For that reason it becomes obligatory upon true friends of the cause of the higher learning and the equitable consideration of the academic men of the country, to supplement the glowing account which Mr. Pritchett contributes to Mr. Carnegie's album, with omitted incidents of the voyage, and some comments of the passengers. Unfortunate as the situation in which the "Carnegie Flounderation" finds itself, it is still possible by a radical change of government and policy to make of it an aid to the cause of higher learning, even when a great proportion of the present funds have been spent, as they must be, in the payment of accrued liabilities. It can be done by placing its affairs in the hands of the professors themselves, under a leader responsible to the profession for which alone the entire institutions exist.

Foreign Correspondence

Toward a New International

London, May 8

THE holding of the Berne Conference has revealed a serious deficiency in the machinery for international good understanding. If you are a socialist with an international mind, you are a member of an organization which transcends national boundaries and enables you to get and keep in touch with those who, in other lands, are working for the causes in which you believe. If, however, with an international mind, you happen to be an individualist in politics and economics, you have no means of coöperation with foreign workers in your efforts to promote a better international order. I had the privilege recently of discussing with Edmund D. Morel, one of the leading British experts on such questions, what can be done to fill this gap. He said:

The time seems ripe for a new international enterprise of a scientific and constructive type. We have had a good many peace societies of various kinds, with international affiliations, but they have been, in the main, associations of persons brought together by the humane anti-war sentiment, without any real grip of the problems out of which war springs. You will remember a society that was founded a few years before the war for the promotion of Anglo-German friendship. It was active in holding banquets and arranging an interchange of visits, but I felt at the time that all this well-intentioned effort would come to nothing so long as it ignored such questions as our political relations with France and Russia. The event has justified my estimate of its futility. We need to get down a great deal deeper, and tackle the conditions that lie at the root of international conflict. A mere pacifist sentiment is not enough. It does nothing to prevent war, and, as soon as war breaks out, many of the persons who have been prompted by this motive to join peace societies become almost indistinguishable from jingoes. I am sure that in every country there are many people, besides the socialists, who would gladly assist in the creation of an international organization on a more adequate basis and with a more definite and more carefully thought-out programme. The traditional interests that support such conditions as make war inevitable are still so powerful that we need an equally strong organization to meet them.

"Can you give me some idea," I asked, "of the kind of questions that such a society would deal with?" To which Mr. Morel replied:

The recent controversies respecting the League of Nations suggest the nature of the matters it would have to consider. Apart from the necessity of working for the amendment of the covenant itself, there will always remain a need of vigilance and assistance with regard to the carrying out of its provisions. Take, for instance, the prohibition of secret treaties. The pressure of a strong public opinion will be required everywhere to secure that this prohibition is enforced and that it is not evaded by a resort to secret understandings. It will be necessary, again, to see that the mandatory provisions of the League are made a reality. I regard the future of tropical countries as one of the gravest questions with which the statesmen of the world are confronted. Scarcely anyone realizes how vast are the territories concerned. People speak of tropical Africa as though it were a sort of Dorset. Do you know that the German possessions in tropical Africa amount to only 700,000 square miles out of a total of 6,700,000? The government of so huge an area by a single international authority is impossible. Separate European administration must continue to exist. The mandatory system should be extended, if the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

League is resolved to take the tropical African problem in hand and draw up a broad policy of just and scientific administration for those territories. To limit the mandatory principle to the ex-German dependencies—which means, in effect, to hand them over to Britain and France—looks too much like the old system of colonial conquests following successful war. Native society in these vast regions is in a more or less primitive condition. But an indigenous mechanism of government exists. The main task of an honest white Administration in these territories is to preserve the rights of the native people in their land, to help them to develop their own country for their own benefit and the benefit of the world, and to keep out the exploiting European syndicate and company promoter. The international society I am proposing would need not only to face the specific problems of tropical Africa, but to grapple with all the questions involved in imperialism—that single word that is used to denote so many different ideals. Equality of trade relationships is another matter so closely affecting the maintenance of international peace that it will require constant attention.

I have been speaking on the assumption that the most optimistic forecasts respecting a League of Nations are fulfilled. If, however, the Paris Conference should disappoint our hopes, the need of international coöperation among men and women of good-will will be even more urgent. Should the negotiations at Paris break down, there will be serious risk before long of the outbreak of a violent Anglo-French quarrel and a violent Anglo-American quarrel. We ought to leave no stone unturned to prevent so deplorable a result. And there will be no way of preventing it except by removing the causes that produce friction. In addition to the problems that we can see and foresee today, there will constantly be arising new emergencies which will have to be met, at the moment when they occur, by new applications of the principles on which the proposals for a League of Nations are founded. For all such work as this a constructive and scientific international organization would be of the highest value.

You ask if I would exclude socialists from this proposed organization? By no means. The fact that they already possess an International of their own need not prevent them from joining this also. We should not trouble whether persons and societies that joined us were socialists or individualists. Either would be welcome, so long as they were in sympathy with our purpose. We should not reject the assistance of members of any political party, so long as they were internationalists and democrats. There are some socialists, I know, who attribute all wars to capitalism alone. I believe, for myself, that capitalism accounts for a good deal, but I cannot regard it as the sole cause. In so far, however, as socialists were willing to coöperate in the broader programme of activities necessary to prevent international discord, their help would be as valuable as that of anyone else.

When I raised the question of the practical steps to be taken for the formation of such an association, Mr. Morel told me that, so far as Great Britain was concerned, the Union of Democratic Control, of which he is the secretary as well as one of the founders, would readily act as a nucleus for the larger body. For the benefit of American readers, it may be as well to explain that this Union was formed early in the autumn of 1914, not as a pacifist society—it has never, for example, taken the attitude of the Fellowship of Reconciliation—but in order to promote, during the war, the adoption of such a national policy as would ensure a permanent peace at the conclusion of hostilities. It based its position on the belief that war is not a military business alone, but is bound to be closely affected throughout by political considerations also. Its programme, accordingly, consisted of five points which may be summarized as follows: (1) No transference of a province from one Government to another without the consent of the population of that province. (2) Democratic control of foreign policy, and no secret treaties. (3) The ending of balance-of-power alliances and the setting-up of an international council. (4) Drastic reduction of armaments all round. (5) No economic war after the military operations have ceased. In addition to Mr. Morel himself, the principal founders of the Union were Charles Trevelyan, a son of Sir G. O. Trevelyan, and a former member of Mr. Asquith's Ministry, from which he resigned at the outbreak of the war; Arthur Ponsonby, formerly principal private secretary to Premier Campbell-Bannerman and son of a high official at the Court of Queen Victoria; and Norman Angell, author of "The Great Illusion." Labor was represented not only by J. Ramsay Macdonald, but by Arthur Henderson, who was a member of the general council of the Union at the time he was taken into the Cabinet by Mr. Asquith. It may justly be claimed by the Union that it has been one of the most successful of the many propagandist associations formed during the war. Five years ago British labor, except for a few of its parliamentary leaders, was indifferent to questions of foreign policy and troubled itself little about diplomatic affairs. The keen interest it shows in such subjects today was largely awakened by the addresses given by representatives of this Union to local-trade councils and other trade-union meetings up and down the country. But its most notable success is the conversion of the country as a whole—though not everybody, perhaps, has yet realized all the implications of the change—to the Union's programme, which is obviously in essentials the same as President Wilson's Fourteen Points. When the British Government, supported by public opinion, incorporated the Fourteen Points in the terms of the armistice, the activities of the Union received their final and indisputable vindication. That the negotiators at Paris have flouted the Fourteen Points indicates nothing more than the blindness of the negotiators.

We are now (Mr. Morel informed me) getting again into touch with foreign sympathizers with whom communication has been difficult during the war, though, of course, we cannot at present link up with anyone in Russia, Austria, or Germany. We are constantly getting gratifying and unexpected evidences of the extent of our influence. During the last few days there has reached our office a tastefully-produced Japanese translation of Mr. Ponsonby's little book on "Wars and Treaties." We have also received Dutch and Danish translations of some of my own books, and there is a report that a Russian translation of one of them was seen by an officer in the Caucasus. We have ourselves had nothing to do with the production of these translations. The first we knew of them was their arrival at our office in London. We are hoping shortly to extend our opportunities by the issue of a monthly publication to be called *Foreign Affairs*, with the sub-title, "A Journal for International Understanding."

When I speak of the service the Union is willing to render in starting this new undertaking, I do not mean to suggest in any way that we want to "boss the show." What we wish to do is to give practical assistance in the first steps towards the formation of what may ultimately become a complete and powerful organization. The work before us is one, as the French say, *de longue haleine*. No doubt, in our methods and plans we shall be able to profit greatly from the experience of the socialists in the construction of their International. The task immediately before us is to plant and water the seed, and who knows what it may produce? Look at what has happened during the last few weeks. Institutions that seemed built of granite have disappeared overnight, simply because the people lifted up their little finger and said: "We don't want them any longer."

HERBERT W. HORWILL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Walt Whitman—A Centenary View

By PERCY H. BOYNTON

JOHN BURROUGHS tells of the staff of a leading daily paper in New York waiting to be paid off one Saturday afternoon in 1855, greeting the passages that were read aloud to them from "Leaves of Grass" with "peals upon peals of ironical laughter." Whitman's own family were indifferent. His brother George said he "didn't read it at all—didn't think it worth reading—fingered it a little. Mother thought as I did. Mother said that if 'Hiawatha' was poetry, perhaps Walt's was." Young men like Thoreau and Burroughs were moved to admiration in their obscurity, but their opinion counted for nothing with the multitude. Thoreau's endorsement is worth quoting now: "I have just read his second edition [1856], which he gave me, and it has done me more good than any reading for a long time. . . . I have found his poems exhilarating, encouraging. . . . We ought to rejoice greatly in him. He occasionally suggests something a little more than human. You can't confound him with the other inhabitants of Brooklyn or New York. How they must shudder when they read him! . . . Since I have seen him I find I am not disturbed by any brag or egoism in his book. He may turn out the least of a braggart of all, having a better right to be confident." But Emerson was the single man of influence to "greet [Whitman] at the beginning of a great career."

Whitman had, of course, determined his own reception when he wrote:

> Bearded, gray-necked, sunburnt, forbidding, I have arrived,
> To be wrestled with as I pass for the solid prizes of the universe,
> For such I afford whoever can persevere to win them.

The enlarged edition of 1856 received more attention and correspondingly more abuse. His frank and often wanton treatment of sex gave pause to almost every reader, and qualified the approval of his strongest champions. Emerson wrote to Carlyle: "One book, last summer, came out in New York, a non-descript monster, which yet had terrible eyes and buffalo strength, and was indisputably American—which I thought to send you; but the book throve so badly with the few to whom I showed it, and wanted good morals so much, that I never did. Yet I believe now again I shall." In the meanwhile, the ultra-respectable folk of the Jaffrey Pyncheon type were eager to hound Whitman and his publishers out of society. Undoubtedly this advertising helped the circulation of the again enlarged edition of 1860.

During the decade of the Civil War Whitman neither gained nor lost fame. It was clear that he was not to be popular, but that the poets were to take him more seriously. A Whitman vogue began to develop among the consciously literary, just as a Browning vogue did in the same years. It is rather a misfortune than otherwise for any art or artist to become the subject of a cult; but the growth of Whitman's repute was slow and was rooted in the regard of other artists. In the years near 1870 essays and reviews in England and Germany showed how deeply "Leaves of Grass" impressed the small group who recognized the essentials of poetry and were not afraid to acknowledge their debt to the strange innovator. The timid culture of America at first shrank as usual from any native work which was un-European in look and tone, and lagged behind foreign endorsement of something freshly American, quite as it was doing in the cases of Mark Twain and Joaquin Miller. When Whitman's countrymen did begin to take account of him, the heartfelt admiration of Freiligrath in Germany and of Swinburne, William Michael Rossetti, and John Addington Symonds in England, the published charge that America was neglecting a great poet, and the public offer of assistance from English friends combined to build up for "the good gray poet" a body of support to which the belated interest of the would-be intellectuals was a negligible addition. In the later years of his life the income received from his writings was enough to maintain him in decent poverty.

Ironical laughter and cheap epigram always drown sober criticism of artistic innovation, and always confuse the issue by treating charlatan and prophet alike. The critics were much too noisy about Whitman's versification, as they still are in connection with the freer verse forms of today. They have failed to state that the form of "Leaves of Grass" was the result of neither laziness nor inability to cope with the familiar measures, that Whitman's earliest verse was quite conventional; they have missed the unlabelled stanzas scattered through poems written in Whitman's own manner; and they have been deaf to the distinctions between the vitality of Whitman's rhythms and the flabby experiments by certain of his contemporaries. Because he was prolific and uneven in execution he did supply openings for critics as well as scoffers. Yet the real verdict on Whitman's form is pronounced by the increasing number of poets who have adopted it.

The most violent objections launched at Whitman were based on his unprecedented frankness in matters of sex. The prevailing Victorian conspiracy of silence had bred vicious ignorance and distorted half-knowledge; and while it was leading to morbid curiosities and furtive indulgences, it encouraged hysterical protestations at any open violations of the codes for speech or action. The whole chaste public did protest too much. So Whitman was made a scapegoat, as George Eliot was. The grounds were utterly different, but they were both attacked as savagely as Byron had been, who was different from both and far more culpable. And the merits of the discussions are obscured by the fact that however much in error the poets may have been, their accusers were hardly less in the wrong. Out of the babel of talk about Whitman one clearest note emerged in the much-quoted letter from Mrs. Gilchrist to Rossetti: A woman could read Whitman without offence, therefore let no man bark; the instinct for reticence was right, but shame was ugly only when it hid an ugly thing; evil be to him who evil thought. This was liberal-minded, courageous for those days, rather more tolerant than all judgments would be even today. Many an ultra-modern is more wanton than Whitman was at his worst, and most modern readers who are disturbed by his offensive passages are willing to leave unread the few score lines that are responsible for all the turmoil.

By the middle of the eighties Whitman had become a monumental fact that no critic of American poetry could overlook, even though the sight of him filled the spectator—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the words of the old critical formula—with "pity and terror." The point is demonstrated by the commentaries of Richardson and Stedman in this decade. Richardson, in his "History of American Literature" of 1886, was evidently perturbed. Whitman, he wrote, had "strength without artistic power or desire," and though he was only the equal of Taylor, Stoddard, Stedman, and Aldrich, he had attracted international adulation by "magnifying the physical and the crudely spontaneous." Richardson was quite open-minded as to the rhythms adopted by Whitman, but in his excitement screamed that the sexuality of Whitman's poems formed "their most obvious characteristic," and denied to him spiritual sense sufficient to make him a seer or an artist. In the end he paid the Camden bard the high compliment of denying that he alone would mould the future song of America—and quoted from Stedman's "Music at Home" to reinforce his contention.

Stedman, who had published "Poets of America" the year before, was more discerning. Indeed, he shines in the light of his admiration for a man from whom he so differed. Nothing that he wrote is larger-hearted than his Whitman essay. Stedman was fair to Whitman's versification, though he dissented from it; he deprecated the sex-frankness, but did not stoop to drawing false analogies between the experiences of passion and the circulation of the blood or the digestive processes. He refrained from the unfairness of comparative criticism which selects the best part of one poet for comparison with the worst of another; and he took honest heed of the essential things that Whitman had to say. However, he was hard pressed by the consciousness of Whitman's growing vogue, and he betrayed all unawares the grounds for his uneasiness—the fact that Whitman was not a poet of gentility. Note his natural resort to indoor metaphors: "A man does not care to be driven with blows and hard names, even to a feast, nor to have the host brag too much of the entertainment." "The display of things natural, indeed, but which we think it unnatural to exhibit on the highway, or in the reading-room and parlor." And finally, he found some comfort in discrediting the nature of Whitman's fame and friends: "He is, in a sense, the poet of the over-refined and the doctrinaires . . . and appeals most to those who long for a reaction, a new beginning." A soft indictment!

To this Mr. Barrett Wendell returned in the "Literary History of America" (1900), but without either the friendliness or the urbanity of Stedman. "One can see why the decadent taste of modern Europe has welcomed him so much more ardently than he has ever been welcomed at home; in temper and style he was an exotic member of that sterile brotherhood which eagerly greeted him abroad." As for literary gentility, Mr. Wendell is "another kind of reader [who] distrusts literary eccentricity as instinctively as polite people distrust bad manners." Out of patience with Whitman's theory of democracy, he unfortunately seemed to feel that Whitman had forfeited all claim to good manners from polite people, and abused him roundly. "In an inextricable hodge-podge you find at once beautiful phrases and silly gabble, tender imagination and insolent commonplace." He is guilty of "eccentric insolence both of phrase and temper"; "his jargon is amorphously meaningless." The stanzas of "Brooklyn Ferry" are "confused, inarticulate, and surging in a mad kind of rhythm which sounds as if hexameters were trying to bubble through sewage." These excerpts, thus detached, are not fair to the author of the "Literary History of America," for they are usually coupled with backhanded acknowledgments of Whitman's virtues and powers—as of the Lord, loving whom he chasteneth. They are cited here simply as illustrating the last example of just this critical attitude toward Whitman.

Within the next few years Whitman was, as it were, elected to the academy through his inclusion in the English and the American Men of Letters Series—in the former with George R. Carpenter's incisive analysis, and in the latter with Bliss Perry's very respectful treatment. There is an immense difference between writing a chapter upon a poet and writing a book upon the same man. A chapter may be demanded by the nature and proportions of a larger undertaking, and may be executed with mental reservations or even reluctance; but a book, as far as the motive is concerned, is, like beauty, its own excuse for being. So from these two men, neither of whom was champion or disciple, Whitman came into his own; and the doctrinaire-decadent thesis was once for all dismissed. In the meanwhile the *Conservator* has continued sturdily on its way as a brave little Whitman organ, and foreign attention, except from Germany, has not waned. There have been a baker's dozen of books, essays, and translations in French, Spanish, Italian, and Russian since 1910, according to the "Cambridge History of American Literature."

The latest word, however, is being said on Whitman by the poets, and not by the critics. James Huneker, writing his "Iconoclasts" in 1905, declared: "Poe is the literary ancestor of nearly all the Parnassian and Diabolic groups. . . . If we have no great school of literature in America, we can at least point to Poe as the progenitor of a half-dozen continental literatures." Now comes Mr. Untermeyer's "New Era in American Poetry," which could almost be described as a series of essays on Whitman in relation to his literary progeny. Granting the difference in bias between the two commentators, the striking fact is that Mr. Huneker's dictum was true and natural fourteen years ago, and that Mr. Untermeyer's is inevitable today. For it was Poe rather than Whitman who had a peculiar vogue with the decadents, and it is Whitman rather than anybody else who is the animating force in contemporary poetry. There are explicit references by poets who owe nothing to his style. His intonations have been attempted by all kinds of versifiers, and with all kinds of success. His point of view has been adopted by many a frank disciple. Vers-librists and imagists, Moody and Carpenter, Masters and Fletcher, Oppenheim and Untermeyer, Ficke and Wattles—it would be briefer to list those who are not in his debt. The best word for them all has been said by Witter Bynner:

> Somebody called Walt Whitman
> Dead!
> He is alive instead,
> Alive as I am. When I lift my head,
> His head is lifted. When his brave mouth speaks,
> My lips contain his word. And when his rocker creaks
> Ghostly in Camden, there I sit in it and watch my hand grow old
> And take upon my constant lips the kiss of younger truth. . . .
> It is my joy to tell and to be told
> That he in all the world and me,
> Cannot be dead,
> That I, in all the world and him, youth after youth
> Shall lift my head.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Blockade

By KATHRYN PECK

SPRING—and child faces, bloodless, gaunt and old;
May—with its singing breath:
And four old men who speak of gold,
And hate and death.

May—and the myriad leaves a-quiver set;
Spring—and the song of birth once more begun:
And four old men who patch and fret,
In a dead tongue.

Call out our shame, green pennants of the May,
Burn it upon the coming years,
That bloody gold means more to us today
Than children's tears.

Cursed with success, my country, you have failed;
Not theirs, but ours the loss:
You speak no word with two great nations nailed
On Hunger's cross.

In the Driftway

IT is fortunate that the Whitman centenary falls at this particular moment of history. If there is any anodyne in literature for the fever and madness of these times it is contained, the Drifter believes, between the covers of "Leaves of Grass," and the celebrations of this month will lead many thousands of readers, new and old, to this perennial well of healing. While the covenants and treaties and agreements and memoranda, ream upon ream, of our lawyer-politicians fill the world like a locust plague, what could be more salutary than the prophetic voice of Walt, speaking serenely "over the carnage"?

Be not disheartened, affection shall solve the problems of freedom yet,
Those who love each other shall become invincible, . . .
The dependence of Liberty shall be lovers,
The continuance of Equality shall be comrades. . . .
(Were you looking to be held together by lawyers?
Or by an agreement on a paper? or by arms?
Nay, nor the world, nor any living thing, will so cohere.)

* * * * *

PEOPLE complain nowadays that the gracious art of hospitality is falling into disuse. What a surprise, then, to learn from the lips of one of our own generals, that our troops in Siberia are the "guests" of the country! This would, of course, make it almost compulsory for our men to accept the best the country has to offer, for a guest must be first of all receptive. In the Drifter's experience there are four varieties of guests, the paying, the self-inviting, the inevitable, and those whom the host delighteth to honor. It may be that the Kolchak Inn displayed a sign of "Paying Guests Received Here," and that in the darkness of the Siberian winter our men mistook the rendezvous. Or it may be that in pursuance of the highest example the country affords, they have crossed the seas as self-inviting guests. It is also possible that their Siberian hosts may classify them as inevitable guests. In any case the Drifter is reminded of Cousin Mehitable who appeared at his grandfather's house "to spend the day"—and who stayed forty years.

* * * * *

IT gives the Drifter a pang to hear of the suspension of the Flower Mission, after nearly fifty years of its graceful ministry. As a boy, it served the Drifter as a weekly excuse for getting out into the spring woods or the summer pastures, to bring back generous loads of azalea and laurel, or baskets filled with violets, ferns, and columbines. No expedition was more rewarding than that to the daisy fields, though the distant quest for arbutus was more adventurous. A picnic by the way was, of course, unavoidable. Returning with the old buggy piled with spoils, it was the province of the womenfolk to tie neat nosegays to be packed in hampers for the hospitals and the dwellers in close city streets. This was sharing, and not giving, an interchange of beauty—flowers for smiles—and not the doling of material things, as even a boy could see. It is a pity the Government cannot afford railway transportation of a few posies for the sick. When we are all duly Americanized shall we be immune to such a venial weakness as a love of flowers?

* * * * *

HOUSECLEANING has never been a concern of the Drifter's, but this spring he heralds it with joy. Now that the drives are over, Dame Knickerbocker may go on her knees and wield the scrubbing brushes of her ancestors. Posters, billboards, street signs need flaunt no longer. Churches and public buildings may resume their pre-war dignity of demeanor (outwardly and inwardly). The parlor window need no longer display the family's patriotic rating. The Drifter's buttonhole may even be adorned with a pansy, to replace the sequence of multicolored buttons that now repose in the tin box with the family service stripes. Pasteboard arches (including the one which records the battle of Murmansk among those in which we have been victorious over enemies) may be put painlessly out of the way. Window boxes may gradually vary the accepted red and white (daisies) and blue (pansies), though it may be long before the scarlet geranium will be tolerated. Service caps are giving way to straw hats. Even the uniformed sisterhood is reluctantly parting with a becoming garb. Best of all, the flag is no longer a tattered and bedraggled victim of conspicuous neglect. Henceforth, the Drifter hopes, the household flag will rest decently in the cedar chest, ready to be flung out to the sunshine on days of joy, or tender memorial, or great thanksgiving. Outwardly we are getting ready for peace. And inwardly?

THE DRIFTER

Contributors to this Issue

JOSEPH JASTROW is professor of psychology in the University of Wisconsin.

PERCY H. BOYNTON is associate professor of English in the University of Chicago, and the editor of a recently-published "Book of American Poetry."

LUDWIG LEWISOHN, formerly of the faculty of Ohio State University, has written extensively on dramatic subjects. His latest book deals with "The Modern Drama."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

A Fitting Memorial

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A memorial to Henry Morse Stephens is being raised by subscription. The sum of $300,000 will be used to build a Students' Union on the campus at Berkeley, as an expression of Morse Stephens's belief in student comradeship and self-government, and to carry on his ideals of democracy and friendship.

The sum of $30,000 will be used to support a travelling fellowship in history, as an expression of his devotion to historical research.

A nation-wide campaign is being undertaken to raise this fund by June 4, Commencement Day at the University of California.

University of California, May 21 ALUMNUS

The True Place for a Just Man

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I append an excerpt from Thoreau that may interest your readers, in view of the recent statement given forth by Eugene V. Debs—not because it corroborates the comrade; rather because of its universality:

"Under a Government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison. The proper place today, the only place which Massachusetts has provided for her freer and less desponding spirits, is in her prisons, to be put out and locked out of the state by her own act, as they have already put themselves out by their principles. . . . If any think that their influence would be lost there, and their voices no longer afflict the ear of the state, that they would not be as an enemy within its walls, they do not know by how much truth is stronger than error, nor how much more eloquently and effectively he can combat injustice who has experienced a little in his own person."

Wheeling, W. Va., May 16 LOUIS A. MISCHKIND

One and Inseparable

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial exposition of the so-called peace treaty is admirably concise, and, considering the monstrosity of America's, and especially Mr. Wilson's, part in it, tempered and charitable. As you say, the time to mince words is gone; the issues are plain; though we may differ on the methods to restore human freedom and truth in ultimate aims all liberty-loving mankind is one and inseparable.

Chicago, May 22 CARL HOERMAN

Glad Tidings from Small Nations

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: At a time of rampant chauvinism and imperialistic greed, men of goodwill who long for peace on earth will learn with grateful joy that the spirit of live-and-let-live does really exist. Under the arresting caption, "Denmark Wants Less," the *New York Times* of Sunday, May 18, prints a letter from Mr. Roger Nielsen, Technical Adviser to the Royal Danish Legation, which should hearten every bona-fide liberal. Nowhere, perhaps, is there a stronger community of national sentiment than in Denmark, nowhere a greater determination to preserve the national culture, nowhere a truer patriotism. There is great satisfaction, Mr. Nielsen writes, at the prospect of the speedy reunion of northern Slesvig with the motherland, because northern Slesvig is Danish in language and culture. But the peace treaty provides for a plébiscite in southern, as well as in northern, Slesvig, and the Danes are afraid that the former, which is German, will vote for annexation to Denmark in order to escape the burdens which it would have to bear if it remained a part of Germany. Not only is there no desire among the Danes for the annexation of southern Slesvig, but, according to Mr. Nielsen, Denmark might even refuse to accept this German population if they voted for annexation. The Danes are wise in their generation, for they have profited by observation of the results of efforts to rule alien and discontented peoples. From Switzerland, too, comes good news. The German-speaking inhabitants of the former Austrian crown-land of Vorarlberg have voted in favor of union with Switzerland, but the canny Swiss are not to be imposed on so easily. The plébiscite is a game that two can play at, and they have decided to submit to a plébiscite of their own the question of whether or not these German-speaking people shall be annexed. The Danes and the Swiss, it seems, are hopelessly addicted to staying at home and minding their own business.

New York, May 20 ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER

The Albanian Minarets in the Greek Bag

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR:

'Ο Θεός, τὸ δίκαιον, τὸ ἔθνος, ἡ γλῶσσα, ἡ 'Αλβανία, ὁ ἀλβανισμός!

(Sami Bey)

An Albanian proverb says: "You cannot put minarets into a bag" (*Minarja në thes nuk hîn*). Mr. Theodore P. Ion's attempt to accomplish such an impossible undertaking (see the *Nation* of May 3) is a good illustration of the proverb. The Albanian minarets are sticking out of his bag. Mr. Ion says: "Moreover, all the Epirotes (the name he gives to South Albanians) know Greek. It is the only language used by them in commercial correspondence. It is the only language studied by them in the schools." I have met many South Albanians who could not speak Greek at all. Except during a few short intervals, the Turkish Government did not allow the Albanians to have schools in their own language, so that they were obliged to send their children to either Greek or Turkish schools. The pupils of the Greek schools acquired Greek as a matter of course, but the pupils of the Turkish schools showed the same proficiency in the Turkish tongue. The Albanian graduates of the Turkish schools are Albanian to the core. At the present time there are plenty of Albanian schools, of course. As to the Albanian orthodox churches, we must not forget that the Greek bishops have often refused to consecrate them, so that recourse was had to the Russian bishops.

One of the finest traits of the Albanians is their religious tolerance. Many Albanian Mohammedans were present at that impressive ceremony at the Cathedral of Saint Nicholas in New York, last November, when the Very Reverend Fan S. Noli was elevated to the rank of Mitred Abbot and Archimandrite by the Russian Archbishop Alexander.

Mr. Ion informs us that the Austrian and Italian diplomacy have for political reasons given the appellation of southern Albania to northern Epirus. Now in Malte-Brun's "Abrégé de géographie," Paris, 1842 (p. 454), we read: "L'Albanie occupe tout l'espace compris de l'est à l'ouest entre la chaîne des monts Grammos et Metrovo et la mer Adriatique, et du nord au sud depuis les montagnes méridionales du Monténegro jusqu'au golfe d'Arta ou de Prévésa."

Mr. Ion calls the Albanian language a jargon. My knowledge of the Albanian tongue is yet a very imperfect one, but I have read with great pleasure the Albanian folk-tales and songs collected by v. Hahn, Jarník, Dozon, Mitkos, Pedersen, and, last and least, by myself. Sami Bey's "Besa" would do honor to any country, and I have spent many a delightful hour in reading the poetry of Pashko Vása, Prennushi, Postrippa, Asdrén and Naim Be Frasheri. *Ars non habet osorem nisi ignorantem!*

Worcester, Mass., May 16 JOSEPH DE PEROTT

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Farragut and Jellicoe

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The death on May 2 of Captain Singer, the Confederate officer to whom credit is given for the fabrication of the torpedo which destroyed the Tecumseh in Mobile Bay, recalls your recent article on Admiral Jellicoe's "The Grand Fleet." To the lay mind it would seem that the reviewer's desire for an effective contrast has led him into grave injustice toward the English admiral. "Unlike Farragut, who on a memorable and much more critical occasion said, 'Damn the torpedoes! Go ahead!' Jellicoe promptly drew his ships away." Why was the attack on Mobile Bay a much more critical occasion than the fight off Jutland? The reviewer seems to think that a complete victory for the English might have brought the war to a prompt close. Would not the destruction of the grand fleet have had a similar result? I have some difficulty in imagining any more critical occasion. It is well known that the use of torpedoes in naval warfare was in its infancy during our Civil War. Is it true that lack of powder hindered the Confederates from mining the entire channel, and that this fact alone may well have saved the Federal fleet from destruction? I am far from wishing to tarnish in any way the glory of Farragut; but, considering that there is an enormous difference in the situations which the two admirals had to face, is it fair to institute such a kind of comparison of their action?

Houston, Texas, May 10 BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE

[The expression "much more critical occasion" was used in a naval, not a political sense. Farragut's fleet, in the thick of a mine field and threatened with destruction, escaped by boldly facing the danger. Jellicoe saved his by keeping out of danger. The one pushed on to victory; the other is still explaining why he did not win. Of course the annihilation of the Grand Fleet would have been highly disastrous, but is this result at all probable, I might almost say possible, had it been commanded by a Nelson, or a Farragut, not to mention a Beatty? In its long list of successes the British Navy has always acted on the offensive —never before, to my knowledge, in defence. At Jutland it certainly did not live up to its traditions. Why did it come out at all, if not to fight? Whether or no lack of powder prevented the Confederates from mining the entire channel at Mobile, I am unable to state.—THE REVIEWER.]

A Legend Launched

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is interesting to catch a legend at its start; to be able to record the date and place of its birth and who are its parents. A legend about the nationalization of woman in Soviet Hungary has already come into being. It is an instructive example of a myth in the making; and in view of the difficulties encountered by those partisans of truth who have refused to credit all the reports about the Russian nationalization decree, it may be well to trace the Hungarian *varians* to its source before the source is lost from sight.

On April 30 the New York morning newspapers printed a Budapest dispatch, credited to the Associated Press, and stating that "the law to communize women was actually framed and in the printer's hand for publication when Herr Weltner, one of the Cabinet of bright young men who are now ruling the fate of the former kingdom" went home for supper and, during the meal, told his wife and mother-in-law about the projected reform. "Weltner explained that in the future women would be free, too; that they would be permitted to choose their own husbands and discard them if they liked, by the simple process of paying a few cents for a legal paper declaring their 'unfitness' for married life. Further conversation developed the fact that the new law also gave husbands the same right; that children might be turned over to the care of the state, so that both husband and wife would get rid of the duties and responsibilities of rearing their offspring." To this, we are told, the ladies objected in such emphatic manner that Weltner finally promised to have the whole project stopped. There the story ends. Now it may be unimportant that Herr Weltner, described in the dispatch as one of the "bright young men" who are ruling Hungary, is a man of fifty and a well-known veteran of international Social Democracy. It certainly is not unimportant that, according to the New Standard Dictionary, "to communize" means "to make common; to make common property"; and that, whatever the proposed law, as outlined in the dispatch might do, it would not make women common property. Rather, it would emphasize the fact, so difficult for the champions of old-fashioned divorce laws to grasp, that women are neither private nor public property. It may be said that the proposed law would have tended to destroy the family and the home; that it would have legalized free love; that its execution would have resulted in anarchy, but no one can say that it would have "communized women."

The Hungarian version of the yarn about the nationalization of women, however, has been launched on its career. It is making good progress, and before long we may hope to meet it in one of the bulletins of the National Security League.

New York, May 22 LEGENDARIAN

Seeing Red

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As a member of the Society for the Suppression of Independent and Superfluous Thinking I wish to call your attention to several pieces of Hun-Bolshevist propaganda which have recently come to my attention. Only last Sunday, while crossing the Hudson, I was shocked and surprised to see red flags planted in the river and showing above the water. Now it is all very well to say that these flags were put there for the purpose of warning and guiding ships. The Hun and the Bolshevik are always well supplied with plausible and specious arguments to mislead and seduce the weak and ignorant. This only makes it more important for loyal, one hundred per cent. Americans to expose their deviltry, whatever forms it may assume.

Even more pernicious was the prodigal use of the red feather as a means of exciting enthusiasm for the last Liberty Loan. I do not wish to pass hasty judgment; but the person responsible for this device was probably getting his orders from Moscow, or Wilhelmstrasse, or from both. And finally, as a climax to this malignant campaign of insidious propaganda, the attendants at a concert in the Hippodrome appeared clad in flaming red coats. If this was not a direct incitement to the formation of a Red Guard I renounce all right to be considered a patriotic and intelligent American citizen.

New York, May 12 WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

How to Tell the Birds From the Insects

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just received an anonymous letter from a "gentleman from Montana," in which he says that I have included the cicada among birds in a paper which appeared in the *Nation* of May 3. I am very sorry that my references to the cicada could have given such an impression. I used it as the equivalent of the Greek word τέττιξ, a tree-cricket or locust, greatly beloved by the Greeks. No one who is acquainted with the old Greek literature or who has been in Greece can be ignorant of its nature. I do not know the prevailing usage in Montana, but in the East the word cicada is a legitimate member of the English language and requires no footnote to explain its meaning.

Vassar College, May 12 GRACE H. MACURDY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

Mental Reconstruction

World Power and Evolution. By Ellsworth Huntington. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Can Mankind Survive? By Morrison I. Swift. Boston: Marshall Jones Company.

Remaking a Man. By Courtenay Baylor. New York: Moffat Yard and Company.

The Child's Unconscious Mind. By Wilfrid Lay. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

The Mental Hygiene of Childhood. By William A. White. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

THE shock of the world war has displaced the sense of contented adjustment to things as they are, and compelled consideration of the forces and agencies responsible for their being; in eager, active minds it has invited a pragmatic contemplation of how things may be and should be. The *status quo ante* has been dispossessed of its appeal as a goal; it remains as a lesson—a guide or a caution according to outlook. It has lost the fresh quality of a living ideal, as it reveals the worn and faded coloring of an irrevocable past. The changed attitude applies as vitally to the mental frontiers and the social and psychological relations of men as to political boundaries, economic trade-routes, and the diplomatic intercourse of nations. Men act differently as they think differently, and even more, as they feel differently; their mental reconstruction conditions their practical relations and the motives and direction of their energies.

The modern mind accepts the machinery of systems and programmes, in turn based upon theories and principles; but its optimism in their efficiency has been tempered by the drastic demonstration that the secret inroads of a hostile spirit—like the unseen depredations of white ants—may undermine the substance, and leave unsuspected the hollow shell of our habitations. Hence the present-day searching examination of the foundations, of the nature-set conditions of our social structure, and the wearing qualities of our artificial building-material. Badly constructed dwellings on terra firma are as uncertain as well ordered ones built upon sand; the storms of war have lessened our confidence in the stability of human institutions, and challenged their architectural principles.

The solutions are as various as the specialized interests of the diagnosis of the reformers. Mr. Huntington's examination of the premises is by far the most thorough. He proceeds from the conviction, boldly set forth in his previous contributions, that climate is the key to civilization. In "World Power and Evolution" the argument assumes a larger sweep and a more confident as well as comprehensive interpretation. It begins with a demonstration of the relations between business and health; waves of prosperity follow waves of good health, and financial depressions follow (with a lag) periods of widespread epidemic and a growing death-rate. The mental output in energy and achievement is an issue of the same conditions. It all comes back to health; but in the mechanism through which health operates, Mr. Huntington places the psychological causes above the economic ones. It is when men feel optimistic that the financial tone improves, and their organic welfare determines the tone of their reaction. The contagion of good business is a psychological one. But ultimately health is a matter of climate and more immediately of weather, which together stand for the general and the specific factors of the physical environment.

From another approach health depends upon food, drink, and air. The great bulk of man's efforts goes to the food supply; the water supply is as much in evidence for man and beast and crops; both must be worked for, but air is free and neglected. Truly, we cannot live on air; yet air determines the standard of our living and the finer issues of our efforts. Variability in climate is the great stimulus; variety of weather is the spice of life, and monotony lowers activity. The sensitive fluctuation of the death-rate with variability of weather forms one of the novel contributions of this many-sided treatise.

With the great structural lines thus provided, we are launched upon "the voyage of evolution." Geologic changes are written in the adaptation of organic life to conditions of water and air and temperature. The latest glacial epoch and the post-glacial sequences of climate made the world fit for habitation by the most evolved animals (those that regulate their own temperature), gave brains a chance, and set man free to control the conditions of his living. New types of men and of animals arose in consequence of marked changes of climate—a conclusion which the recent studies in the origins of mutations confirm. Furthermore, the human types reveal the same organic responsiveness to climatic changes, of which fact Professor Boas's demonstration of the changing shape of heads of immigrants in response to our climate (and in opposite directions for Italians and Jews, by reason of the opposite tendencies of their former racial habit and geographic habitat) is cited in corroboration. Once more, organic variability, which is adaptability to circumstance and climate, becomes the clue to the superiority of the Jew, concretely contrasted with the Negro, as both have been transferred to our continent and mode of life.

The excursion in evolution is followed by an historical one in world power. Mr. Huntington traces the rise and fall of the Roman Empire to the changes of climate whose fluctuations are still recoverable through the annual "ring" weather-record of their only survivors—the big trees of California. Rome prospered when its climate improved, and its decay through laxity and luxury are but secondary issues of "climatic" response. The problem of Turkey is climatic, though aggravated by cultural tendencies; the case of Germany and her neighbors is open to similar consideration. Racial character is the effect of physical environment; Germany represents good energy wrongly applied. The failure of Russia, through great spasmodic impulse quickly spent, is the natural impress of climate upon people, reënforced by the complex of political circumstance. World power and the fate of nations are subject to the same forces as determine organic welfare at large and business fluctuations, the output of factory operatives, and the issues of mind in all its directions. More immediately, man proposes, but climate disposes; and the future of London, New York, and Berlin is written in their weather reports.

The very ambition of this interpretation, bringing cosmic and man-made issues together, runs the hazard of joining the sublime and the ridiculous. The reservations with which we follow such conclusions offset the admiration of the brilliancy of speculation. The uncertainty of the scale, on the one hand, and the complication of the factors on the other, reduce proof to conjecture; the evidence is of the type truly called suggestive, not in the usual sense of damning it with faint praise, but by inherent nature. The bearing of it all seems fatalistic, for climate is beyond control; and we remain puppets rather than masters of our fate. Yet that is not the helpful or the justifiable emphasis of Mr. Huntington's thesis. Environment is no more irrevocable than the equally determined factor of our heredity. The thesis emphasizes in a broad organic, almost a cosmic, sense, the play of environmental factors, which indeed in the nearer perspective we can control, or wisely select, wisely counteract when inimical to purpose, and reënforce when favorable. Such conclusions are far, very far, from demonstrable, and the criticism of the methods by which they are reached is fundamental. But there remains a valuable sense of the condition of our past directing such reconstruction as the future invites.

"Can Mankind Survive?" is the despondent as well as the cynical query of the philosophy of radicalism. Mr. Swift proceeds in a spirit of protest and of castigation; he emphasizes the perversity of the human mind in its denial of the principle of evo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lution and change, and its replacement by the worship of the past, and the ideals of fixity and established truth. Through the tyranny of permanent principles mankind became bankrupt; it has followed false prophets through the whole of its history, has crucified the proposers of change and the original minds daring the untried. Human energy has been spent in repression and defeat. One of its fiercest weapons has been the cultivated enmity of all men toward all others beyond the tribe; war is but one example of the suicidal trend of the human race. Evolution thus perverted has been dysgenic, perpetuating the bad. The weak and conforming spirits, the wily unscrupulous types, have gained the power and the succession. That is why great races have died out, from the days of the Cro-Magnon type comparable to those of present rule, to the grandeur that was Rome.

In closer analysis the cardinal sin is the idea that one man has a right to live on another; that notion has always flourished and still prevails. So long as it operates to shape the social order, the race is doomed. Knaves and slaves express the classification of mankind; and all that democracy has added in mitigation is "the increasing right of the slavish mind to be treated politely." The Greeks alone had the truer insight in that they gave intelligence free play; to modern civilization intelligence is an offense, with the heavy penalty of ostracism attached. There is a "sabotage on brains," not intentional and cruel, but no less brutal through the insensibility of the master class.

Primarily responsible for the tragedy is "the Hebrew Choice," by which is meant the renunciation of the world, fervently developed by Christianized religion, and the abandonment of mundane concerns to the mercenary and the base. In this view the world is "but a mean and leaking hut," a trial stage in the eternal life toward which all endeavor and hope are concentrated. In thus throwing the world overboard, religion threw brains with it, and left the world to the mercies of the stupid and the unregenerate. But the baser culprit is Political Economy, which is the only religion that lives and rules. By this device the masters justified their powers, and the servile acknowledged them. Thus has man defeated the purposes of evolution and made the unfit survive. In this process the great instrument is education, which is a method by which the finer minds are systematically destroyed and a stupid mediocrity established. Concretely, the older generation, in possession of ideas and wealth, enslave the young, bend them to their deforming mould. The true function of the youths is to redeem the parents; actually "every fresh generation is damned and drastically spoiled by its predecessor." The last and culminating charge in the pessimistic arraignment is the worship of the material and the economic exploitation of the masses, which enthrones the stupid and establishes the habit of making and gathering rubbish—a futile treadmill manufacture of needless things and a mad rush for their possession. Man is morally below the brutes, in that the brute's fixity of habit is ordained by nature, while man's is of his own diabolical making.

From these premises the path of reconstruction is clear. The human mind must be made over again, and the direction of endeavor and desire reversed. Germany is only a superlative example. "Prussia merely reduced to world-absurdity what has long been sky-clear as national absurdity." The world must be saved by a round-about-face more radical than the French Revolution, more reconstructive than any movement of the past. The new order must be antipodal to the old; evolution must be restored, and the doctrine made supreme that each generation must find its own truth, unhampered by the dead hand of the past, loyal only to the change by which the higher type emerges. Intellect is to be enthroned and slavery of mind and body disappear.

The very factors of psychological self-determination which Mr. Huntington minimizes, Mr. Swift makes central to the understanding of *homo sapiens*, whose wisdom is questioned. Both appeal to evolution; their decipherment of the world-enigma employs different languages with unrelated alphabets. Both employ an heroic scale, painting the world in cosmic strokes, reducing to insignificance our petty movements of the hour. Food for thought abounds, but recipes for practical diets are conspicuously absent. Radicals are ever impatient in such tedious matters as planting trees; forests are more impressive. Under the present mental temper the philosopher—whether bent upon interpreting the past as does Mr. Huntington, or criticising it as does Mr. Swift—deserves a hearing. But listening is not acquiescence; the pragmatic reconstructionist will command his audience more enduringly.

To this latter order belong Mr. Baylor, who offers in "Remaking a Man" a "successful method of mental refitting," and Dr. Lay and Dr. White, who look to the understanding of child-nature for redemption. They all have in common the method of psycho-analysis and the principles emerging from its practice. Mr. Baylor's contribution is slight. He testifies to the efficiency of an analytic consolation after the manner of "the Emmanuel Movement," now brought into relation to the treatment of shell-shock. At the bottom of such impediment of energy lies a faulty mental attitude, induced or aggravated by wearing and worrying friction, or in the cases of shock by some overwhelming experience. The war-shock from which the world is suffering creates the analogy offered by these cases to the remaking of the nations and the finding of oneself again, which is the concrete problem of millions in a devastated world. There may be the consolation of hope in recovery, but hardly any further enlightenment in the parallel.

The modern psychological Diogenes is looking not for an honest Freudian (of which there are many) but for a sane one. He is least likely to find the exemplar among those who apply the Freudian conception to the child mind. Both Dr. Lay's and Dr. White's volumes are riddled with the distortion of perspective which the cult seems to invite. An exaggerated emphasis, the endless harping upon the one much-strummed string of sex, reading sex-meanings into things quite as plainly of other bearing, a tedious reiteration, a woefully thin spreading of a none too well established gospel, a readiness to include within the compass of his book any kind of topic in which the writer happens to have an interest—all this makes for a disorderly, misleading, aimless, and in the case of Dr. White's book a pernicious, kind of manual to place in the hands of readers without the defences of expertness, seeking modest guidance on "the mental hygiene of childhood"—certainly a legitimate and everyday quest. After all, children have survived and grown into fairly decent citizens before the days of Freud; and judicious neglect is as favorable a formula for the rearing of human as of potted plants. Digging up the roots to see how things thrive has its limitations.

The Freudian thesis is a most important contribution to modern psychology; like many other principles of value, it must be rescued from its injudicious friends, who are devoted to it not wisely but too well. And there are ideas here and there in "the child's unconscious mind" that bear a lesson for the proper training that makes mental reconstruction unnecessary, in the spirit of prevention to avoid cure. In that light the problem of reconstruction is the problem of childhood, which is reconstructed many a time before the adult stature is reached; and its patterns remain instructive. But to put forward all the trivial and inconsequential antics and vagaries of a healthy childhood, all the incidental cravings and strivings and blunderings accompanying a commonplace unfoldment of the human cub, as replete with the weighty symbolism of organic vestiges, more particularly reminiscent of the pathological failings of the race—this futurist rendering of tiny trees as mighty forests merged in a patchy, mystical light, reflects the burden of a cult that obstructs more than it sharpens vision.

But the Freudian reconstruction of mental motives, particularly in the devastating sweep of the power motive, which the world war has revealed in such lurid light, remains a perma-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nent beacon of enlightenment to the world-order that is to be. Truly the issue is an individual one, to be repeated in the piecework methods of the school and the family; and the right direction of the start, the avoidance of the snares revealed by the derelicts of blasted and futile careers, is of prime consequence. To the reconstructionist mood which has been thrust upon a too haphazard, too *laissez-faire*, too complacent and high-handed a world, all this is of moment. But where lies the major clue, the *leitmotiv?* Is it in the health of nations as of individuals, and is the security of that dependent upon the climate that we must accept and the control of environment that represents the purposes of men? Is it in the recognition of the injustices and inequalities deposited by the inconsiderate bondage to the past? Is it in the false interpretation of human motives, mistaking the conscious for the whole of our psychology? Amidst these puzzling and baffling questions of nature and institutions, the psychological note seems to carry the fundamental, however complicated by unanalyzable overtones. The instrument of civilization, that which makes or mars human effort, is the mind. Though institutionally expressed, the problem of reconstruction is a psychological one, and the attempts to record the factors of the movement are questionnaires satisfying our obligations of inquiry and our hope of a fairer fate for the generations to come.

Symonds Redivivus

In the Key of Blue and Other Prose Essays. By John Addington Symonds. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Last and First. By John Addington Symonds. New York: Nicholas L. Brown.

MORE characteristic of the Oxford Hellenist than such larger and more pretentious works as "The Renaissance in Italy" and "Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama" is the dainty and lovingly-wrought volume of brief essays that takes its title from the opening study in verbal description, a fantasia on color gradations suggested by the qualities of blue in the dresses of Venetian men and women set against varying backgrounds. For Symonds's subtle, sensitive, not very virile or very profound nature, not altogether equal to the task of properly amassing large quantities of material and incapable of long or lofty philosophic flight, was at its best when working within a narrow plot of ground where there was no danger of becoming involved in certain portions of his subject to the exclusion or under-emphasis of other and perhaps more important parts of it. We welcome, therefore, the new edition of "In the Key of Blue," which has been too long out of print. Some of the essays no longer have the interest that they possessed a generation ago. That on "Culture: Its Meaning and Its Uses," though still of value, recalls lost causes and impossible loyalties and battles long ago. The study of Zola will attract few readers now. E. C. Lefroy's efforts towards a synthesis of Christian and Hellenic ideals of life have been quite forgotten; but there is still matter for contemplation in the gentle dignity with which Symonds treats Lefroy's attack upon himself and Walter Pater, both "Hellenisers" in whom Lefroy should have seen spirits kindred to his own. On the other hand, some of the essays are as fresh today as when they first appeared. "The Dantesque and Platonic Ideals of Love," suggested by the sexcentenary of Beatrice Portinari, has to do with a theme that always called forth the finest powers of Symonds's introspective, meditative intellect. The single essay in art-criticism, "On an Altar-piece by Tiepolo," is in discrimination and ability to translate into words the impressions made by color and line worthy of a place with the similar essays of Walter Pater. The earliest written of the pieces, "Clifton and a Lad's Love," beautiful with an unhealthy beauty, has been kept in remembrance through these years by the devotion of Mr. Thomas B. Mosher. So also has the essay on "Mediæval Norman Songs," with the spirited translations that accompany it. But the best part of the book, the part that will win it new life in the minds of those who did not know it in the earlier editions, is the series of descriptive sketches, English and Italian, of mountain and woodland and sky and sea—sketches so delicate, so precise, so colorful (as in the exquisite picture of the Aurora Borealis), so deeply felt by the artist who made them.

Two of Symonds's essays have remained buried in the pages of the *Fortnightly Review* ever since their first appearance. Now at last they have been put into book form. The first, one of the earliest of Symonds's writings, is on Arthur Hugh Clough, a poet and thinker towards whom Symonds was drawn by a common sense of restlessness amidst the welter of the modern world. After Clough's premature death, Symonds came to know his widow and assisted her in the arrangement of her husband's prose remains for publication. The essay, which appeared in 1868, may be regarded as a sort of prelude to Clough's posthumous volume of 1869. Much of it is devoted to detailed analyses of "Amours de Voyage" and "Dipsychus," the former then little known and the latter still unpublished. Of more lasting interest, however, than the discussion of these now little-read poems is Symonds's study of Clough's personality and point of view. With a total unselfishness and confidence in truth, howsoever dimly apprehended by his own mind, Clough was a living witness of the fact that more faith may live in honest doubt than in half the creeds. Like Symonds himself, he sympathized "with the movement that is unquestionably going on towards the simplification and purification of belief."

This movement Symonds illustrates by the Platonic simile of Glaucus rising from the ocean overgrown with weeds and shells. "To pull away these weeds, and to restore the godlike form to its own likeness, is the desire of all thoughtful men whose minds have been directed to religious questions." It is significant that the same simile recurs in the essay entitled "The New Spirit" and is the central fact in Symonds's last word upon the subject that he made his life's work—the Renaissance. The Renaissance had been the theme of his prize-essay at Oxford; now, in 1893, just before his death and seven years after his masterpiece had been completed, he presents his final impression of that mighty movement of the human mind. A serious flaw in "The Renaissance in Italy" is the disproportionate emphasis upon literature and the fine arts, to the almost total exclusion of politics and science, and with a but superficial grasp of its philosophic import. Within the limited confines of this brief last essay he obtains a truer perspective. The Renaissance is seen as "a reacquisition of mental lucidity and moral independence after centuries of purblind somnambulism," and is characterized by a curiosity that led pioneers into new fields of inquiry and through contact with Greek life and art resulted in Humanism, one of the first results of which was the modern rationalistic spirit and which, through its sense of the dignity of this present life, developed, especially in the realm of the fine arts, what may be called Naturalism. At first there was no direct antagonism between this New Spirit and Catholicism; but Criticism, arising from the need to elucidate newly-discovered ancient authors, began presently, fortified by Curiosity, Rationalism, and Naturalism, to reject "everything which could not be proved by positive methods of analysis." The Church, "alarmed by the steady spread of neological opinions," "girded herself up for a conflict to the death in defence of her religious creeds, her system of discipline, her political interests, her temporal power." Giordano Bruno is at once the protagonist of this new movement and the prototype of the modern scientific spirit. The conflict between this spirit and dogmatic theology continues to this day; it is the task of stripping from the form of Glaucus, risen from the ocean depths, the weeds and sea-shells of centuries, to restore again the fair body of the divinity. There are influential and thoughtful men today who differ in entirety with Symonds's view of the matter, and especially with his hostility to the Middle Ages. But the essay deserves preservation as his last pronouncement upon the function of the Renaissance in the development of human history.

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pawns in the Game

The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans. By Robert W. Seton-Watson. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company.

The New Eastern Europe. By Ralph Butler. Longmans, Green, and Company.

ALTHOUGH Dr. Seton-Watson's "The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans" was finished as early as March, 1917—and rather hurriedly finished owing to the author's departure from London on military service—there is much in the book that is piquantly and even distressingly timely. Thus, asserting that "the present war is the direct result of a stubborn refusal on the part of European diplomacy even to try to repair" the evil wrought by the Congress of Vienna, the author continues: "Nor have we today any very sanguine grounds for believing that the diplomats who control the fate of Europe will conduct the Congress of 1917 [!] upon any more honest lines than its predecessors of Vienna, Paris, and Berlin. Only a healthy and energetic public opinion can force the Greys, the Sazonovs, the Jagows, the Burians, the Sonninos, to apply true statesmanship to the national problems which await solution and to abandon the prevailing habit of feeding the public opinion on vague and fulsome programmes, which only too often conceal acts of a thoroughly reactionary character." Since those lines were written the world has passed through the stage of the Fourteen Points. Substitute 1919 for 1917, bring the list of names up to date, and you have a forecast of what is going on today at Versailles.

And listen to the oracular note in the following: "The era which followed the Congress of Vienna was dominated by the Holy Alliance, whose only aim, as expressed in the mystical ideas of Alexander I, was the regeneration of Europe into a true Christian commonwealth." Today we speak of "making the world safe for democracy." Of course, to refer to the League of Nations as the new Holy Alliance is already *vieux jeu;* yet we cannot refrain from quoting the phrase when we read that Metternich "induced Russia and Prussia to join Austria in a declaration of principles, and in the refusal to recognize as a member of the European Alliance any state which was guilty of an internal revolution." Today we see the founders of the League of Nations demanding from an applicant for admission "effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe international obligations," and at the same time refusing to invite Soviet Russia and Carranzist Mexico, the common denominator of the two cases being the disbelief of the Russian and Mexican Governments in the private control of national wealth, and their refusal to accommodate foreign capitalists.

The author traces, rightly it would seem, all the evils that befell continental Europe to the partition of Poland: "It was the original crime of the Polish partition which created a bond of union between the three spoilers and strengthened their alarm at the prospect of any change which might affect their ill-gotten gain." One thinks, involuntarily, of Article Ten of the League Covenant. The Concert of Europe was the euphemistic name for the machinery devised to ward off any such change—a concert in which the death-cries of thousands of massacred Eastern Christians were only too distinctly heard. The history of the Balkan peoples, says Dr. Seton-Watson, is dominated by three central facts: "The long and apparently hopeless struggle of the subject Christian races against alien rule of the most savage and incompetent kind; the perpetual interference of the Great Powers in Balkan affairs in their own purely selfish interests, and the consequent formation of a thick network of intrigue and counter-intrigue with one main thread running through it all—the rivalry of Austria and Russia; and the rise of national feeling steadily leavening the dead mass until, in the Balkan wars of 1912-13, the final stage of liberation was reached, only to be succeeded by partial disillusionment and a transference of the struggle to other fields."

For the preservation of the "balance of power" the deadweight called the Turkish Empire was found indispensable. The story of the dealings of Austria and Russia in the Balkans reads like an unending nightmare of greed and stupidity; yet, on the whole, throughout the last century autocratic Russia was perhaps the only great Power whose Balkan policy, based on motives however selfish, did not work unmixed evil. On the other hand, perhaps the most baleful influence was exercised in the same period by enlightened England, protector of the Balance of Power and, by implication, of the "Sick Man of the East." British blundering, as Dr. Seton-Watson candidly points out, reached its climax in the Crimean War, and again in 1878, when the Peace of San Stefano, with its impossible provisions, furnished the opportunity for the birth, with Lord Beaconsfield as *accoucheur*, of the crowning infamy called the Treaty of Berlin. The latter was rightly characterized by the Rumanian historian Iorga as a (temporarily) successful attempt at the "exploitation, in favor of the Great Powers, at one and the same time, of the national rights of the nations, and the historical rights of the Turks."

Dr. Seton-Watson handles his extremely intricate subject with masterly skill, presenting a wealth of important facts in the framework of a fascinating narrative. He shows that he can be fair even to the Germans—in fact, to everybody except the Magyars, whose very name is a red rag to him. But, with all its modern viewpoint and scientific equipment, the book tends to confirm our belief that at bottom Dr. Seton-Watson is a mystic. He has an implicit faith in the magic virtue of nationality. Now if there is one thing the war has demonstrated effectively it is the essentially negative import of the principle of nationality. If suppressed, nationality has the explosive force of dynamite. But the experiences of the last half year in southeastern Europe prove that the release of nationality does not necessarily solve problems. Like established religion, established nationality lends itself too readily to the aggressive and acquisitive purposes of the powers that be.

Considerations like these do not disturb the unity of Dr. Seton-Watson's outlook. The great mystic idea of the Song of Roland, "Car païenz ont tort et Chrestienz ont droit," dominates his mentality. For him, the Slavs are right; and the enemies of the Slavs, be they Magyar, Turk, or Teuton, are wrong. He does not seem to realize that things are never so simple in this imperfect world. Above all, in his system there is no adequate place for the truth that political and racial divisions are often merely sublimated expressions of economic conflicts.

It is just in the realization of this latter fact that the main strength of Mr. Ralph Butler's book, "The New Eastern Europe," lies. It is a work that belongs with the most valuable contributions to the literature of international politics produced by the war. Not only does Mr. Butler master his subject and document every assertion with an impressive array of historic, geographic, ethnographic, and economic facts, but he is also entirely free from that idolatry which vitiates the work, in this particular domain, of many sincere democrats and liberals. To Mr. Butler there is nothing sacrosanct about an "oppressed nation." He refuses to prostrate himself before the fetish of the nationality principle.

A certain champion of the Rumanian cause, when asked about the fate of the substantial Magyar minorities incorporated in a Greater Rumania, answered: "We Rumanians have been cruelly oppressed and exploited for centuries—we know what it means, and would never practice oppression ourselves." This, of course, runs counter to the entire evidence of history and psychology, and Mr. Butler would be the last to countenance this sort of sentimental nonsense. Of the seven chapters of his book—each an article reprinted from the *Fortnightly*, the *Contemporary*, or the *Edinburgh Review*—four deal with Finland, the Baltic country, Lithuania, and the Ukraine respectively, and three are devoted to Poland. He is not afraid of shattering long-cherished illusions. Thus, in the first chapter he shows that the widely advertised Finnish martyrdom which enlisted, throughout the last decades, the sympathy of western

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberals, has screened off a ruthless economic battle waged by the Swedish aristocracy of Finland against the Finnish working classes—a battle which culminated only the other day in the unspeakable terror of the White Guards and their imported German auxiliaries.

Similarly, Mr. Butler has much keen sympathy for, but extremely little illusion about, that other "martyr race," the Poles. Of course, he treads in beaten paths when he points out that the partition of Poland was the inevitable result of one of the most monstrous systems of domestic misrule the world has ever seen, a system which may be summarized in the fact that for a noble the penalty for killing a serf was a fine of fifteen francs. But Mr. Butler is unrelenting in tracing the ties that link the old Poland with the new. He analyzes the seemingly hopeless muddle of Polish national life, whose principal features are a megalomania lacking all sense of reality, an irrepressible tendency toward dissention and secession, and anti-Semitism. He shows how nationalistic catchwords are utilized by the upper classes to perpetuate the economic subjection of the masses. Yet it would be grave injustice to charge him with an anti-Polish bias. He says of the Poles:

"In all Europe there is no people, with the possible exception of the French, which is naturally so gifted. No one can study Eastern Europe without feeling that they are infinitely the most attractive of the peoples with which he has to do. . . . Their culture is not borrowed—it is original and creative, the true expression of their national genius and their historic tradition. Yet in the political sphere their genius is strangely unfruitful. They are of those artists who produce nothing. Their conceptions are brilliant, but they have no technique, and do not see the need of it; and they never finish their work."

On the whole, in these days of frenzied nationality "The New Eastern Europe" has a highly refreshing quality in the author's persistent treatment of the national idea as one of the factors to be reckoned with, but not as something intrinsically good or even a purpose in itself. He always emphasizes the economic background, and gives tabulated analyses of the shifting in the system of land-holding, where other authors go off into rhapsodies about historic glories and national mission. He is always willing to give the devil his due, even if the devil is appearing in the monocled and gaitered shape of a Baltic Baron. His style has a touch of genuine humor, characteristic of those who do not forget that there is more than one side to every human question.

The Field of Prints

Dutch Landscape Etchers of the Seventeenth Century. By William Aspenwall Bradley. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Les Eaux-Fortes de Rembrandt. Par André Charles Coppier. Paris: Berger-Levrault.
Early Illustrated Books. By Alfred W. Pollard. Second edition. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company.

SUPPOSEDLY a small corner in the wide domain of art, the field of prints has occasioned an extensive literature recorded in the bibliographies of G. Bourcard and Howard C. Levis, and in the New York Public Library's list ("Prints and their Production") of books (about 2,500 titles) in its print room. Although the connection between the two English books here brought together for review seems somewhat tenuous at first sight, yet they well exemplify the wide range of interests offered to the amateur or collector of prints.

Mr. Bradley's papers, originally published in the *Print Collectors' Quarterly* of regretted memory, trace the development of a specialty which has not hitherto had a volume quite to itself. The results of research Mr. Bradley delivers in clear and easy style. Wide general reading furnishes him with many a happy sidelight or parallel, drawn from George Moore, Sir Seymour Haden, Masefield, Pater, Barrès, Kipling, or James Elroy Flecker. Perhaps he is just a bit discursive at moments; perhaps one would like a little fuller consideration of, say, Breenbergh, who could show such breadth in a little plate about two by three inches in size. But in the end, the volume as it stands, crisp and compact, better serves its purpose as a pleasant introduction to a pleasant field.

Despite frequent citations, Mr. Bradley shows the courage of his convictions. Ruysdael shares Rembrandt's throne for a moment. Waterloo is firmly removed a little from that "ancient popularity" to which Sir Frederick Wedmore would return him. Binyon is happily quoted, *re* Ruysdael versus Waterloo, in pointing out "the difference between the man who feels what he cannot perfectly master and the man who has perfect mastery of a facile formula." It is, of course, the old truth that growing sophistication may well bring a partial loss of the directness and sincerity which accompanied the naïveté of earlier work. The growth of the Italianate tradition and the influence of Elsheimer and his circle are interestingly sketched.

Considering his etchers amid their surroundings, Mr. Bradley shows the relation between life and art. One instance of such relation is the sympathetic understanding with which Dutch artists have pictured the flatlands of their native country, lost in a distance of tremulous mistiness—Rembrandt, of course, and Koninck, and Van Goyen in that view of Haren in his sketch-book at Dresden. Of the reproductions in Mr. Bradley's book only two or three quite illustrate this point—one by the naïve Esaias van de Velde, the other assigned to Waterloo and attributed by Dr. Sträter to Seghers. The last-named, that important and experimentative predecessor of Rembrandt, is strangely fascinating to the print-lover.

Rembrandt was omitted by Mr. Bradley; he had already been so much written about. Yet here comes Monsieur Coppier to have his tilt at Bartsch and the rest for their subject arrangement of Rembrandt's etchings, and his try at a readjustment of attributions. As to the first point, the more logical chronological arrangement was already adopted some years ago by A. M. Hind in his useful Rembrandt catalogue, and the British Museum and the New York Public Library similarly broke with tradition in arranging Rembrandt exhibitions. In the matter of attributions, M. Coppier enters into the critics' merry war with interesting theories, based on close study of the prints, their various signatures, certain curlicues and flourishes reproduced "as a touchstone to control authenticity," and the original coppers now with Alvin-Beaumont. As a result he rejects various plates hitherto accepted, labels others "atelier products" of the collaboration of Rembrandt with Lievens (here identified with the "L" in the monogram "R. H. L.") and others, and restores a few rejected by previous cataloguers. "It is indispensable," says he, "to throw on Rembrandt's débuts an abundant light, which too many collectors and dealers had an interest in leaving under the bushel, because it would depreciate a number of pieces in their portfolios, having commercial value only on account of their attribution to Rembrandt."

Leaving M. Coppier's stimulating volume to the more careful perusal of connoisseur and expert, we step backward over a century to a quite different phase of the subject of prints. There has recently come to this country the second edition of Mr. Pollard's most useful book, originally published in 1893. While the body of the text remains the same clear and compact introduction ("popular" in the best sense of the term) to early book illustration, it has been carefully revised in the light of more recent research. Of the elisions, some, at least, might well have been retained—surely this passage in the original preface:

"A book may be very profusely and even very judiciously illustrated without being much the better for it decoratively. . . . The present volume affords a sufficient example of the distinction. The pictures in it have been chosen as illustrations of the books of the past, not as a means of making my own book beautiful, and some of them are out of harmony with the size of the pages and the character of the types here used. In a handbook like the present this is a necessary evil, but the evil is equally conspicuous in a great number of modern books in which the illus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trations are introduced solely for their decorative value. In this matter we have much to learn from the old printers, in whose books, paper, type, illustrations, initial letters, and borders were all so planned as to form a harmonious whole."

The dropping of this paragraph is to be deplored because it accentuated a factor of such basic significance in the making and appreciation of illustrated books. For the same reason the lifting of some illustrations from the surrounding original type, which had been reproduced with them in the first edition, thus emphasizing the essential harmony between type-face and line-cut illustration, is regrettable. Accentuation of this element can hardly be too strong in these days of the indiscriminate use of the half-tone.

All of this, in the end, does not affect the book as a useful piece of writing—clear, to the point, and quite untinged by that myopia of specialism which describes in superlatives every product which it studies. Indeed, Mr. Pollard, in his Introduction to Rose Sketchley's "English Book Illustration of Today," freely admitted that the "range of the earliest illustrators was limited." However, the work of these old book-makers, at its best, shows an attainment of a standard so high that it remains, today, a wonderful example of the exercise of that virtue of appropriateness which, after all, is a fundamental need in any art.

Spain Sees Herself

Blood and Sand (*Sangre y Arena*). By Vicente Blasco Ibáñez. Translated from the Spanish by Mrs. W. A. Gillespie. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company.

Caesar or Nothing. By Pío Baroja. Translated from the Spanish by Louis How. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

THE immense circulation and acceptance (popularity would hardly be the word) attained by "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse" have created a demand for the author's other novels which the publishers are competitively eager to satisfy. Very shortly we shall have before us in English virtually the whole of his work in fiction. It is hardly to be expected that the present somewhat faddish interest in him will survive long enough to justify the translation of his voluminous writings in other fields. Meanwhile he will have helped us approach a race to which we are in some respects more closely akin than to any other of the Latins. About most English translations from French and Italian fiction, however free they may be from foreign idiom, hangs an exotic aroma, a sense of strangeness which the American novel-reader rids himself of with some effort. But the genius of the Spanish literature seems like our own. Who ever forgets his amazed recognition of his own people in the Quixote and Panza of the Ormsby version, or in the measures of FitzGerald's Calderon? For reticence, for irony, for pithy and trenchant humor, for familiar idiom itself, Don and Yankee possess a strikingly similar turn. This similarity is felt more strongly in the work of a Pío Baroja than in that of a Blasco Ibáñez: since the one is a wit and a skeptic, while the other is a reformer and a prophet.

One quality they have in common with each other and with all modern Spanish writers of note—an intense national self-consciousness, a sort of fierce humility urging that the only hope for Spain lies in her awakening to the bathos of her present position and character. "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse" is done upon a huge international canvas, and deals, among other things, with the peril of a commercial civilization summed up in the faith and practice of Prussianism. Most of the novelist's earlier work is compactly regional or national. It attacks directly certain typical abuses—of the priesthood, or the social system, or industrial tyranny, or, as in "Blood and Sand," the national tendency to brutality and cruelty as exemplified in the national "sport" of the bull-ring. This novel is an absolutely simple, clean-cut picture of the character and career of a famous toreador, from the moment when his fame reaches its height to that at which, his courage and his skill and his popularity gone, he contributes his own blood to the arena. As he is carried out to die, a tumult of applause arises from the multitude already greeting a new combat: "It was the roaring of the wild beast, the true and only one." The fighter Gallardo is merely one of its victims: the bull who opposes him is another. While his day lasts, Gallardo himself is the spoiled child of the populace, a Spanish counterpart of our "matinée hero," or movie star: a figure pathetic rather than heroic. The most interesting person in the book, for her own sake, is Doña Sol, the voluptuous patrician who seeks her matings among the finest animals which cross her path—a portrait of ruthless verisimilitude. Pío Baroja, we have said, is skeptic where Blasco Ibáñez is prophet. In "Cæsar or Nothing," as in "The City of the Discreet," the central figure is a Spanish youth of education, uncommon intelligence, and an idealism for the most part concealed behind a veil of mockery. Both see plainly the parlous state of Spain, with her social and political life honeycombed with the tunnels of the Clericals, her people inert or venal—hereditary individualists who have lost initiative and who as yet lack a collective will and intelligence. Quentin, in "The City of the Discreet," after a wild experimental phase, succumbs to the inevitable and becomes that very smug successful manipulator of industrial and political wires whom of all men he despises in his heart. The Cæsar of the later story, who is determined to be himself or nothing, is fain in the end to confess himself—nothing. He is a youth whose trifling manner conceals a real enthusiasm for the cause of liberty, as he interprets that word. He believes that "individual morality consists in adapting one's life to a thought, to a preconceived plan"; and his own plan is to advance the welfare of the masses "by destroying magnates, by putting an end to the power of the rich, by subduing the middle-class. . . . I would hand over the land to the peasants, I would send delegates to the provinces to make hygiene obligatory, and my dictatorship should tear their nets of religion, of property, of theocracy." Pretty thoroughgoing Bolshevism, dictatorship and all! Cæsar means most of it, though it is far less that he actually achieves later on. Through clerical influence he gets an entry into the politics of the city of Castro. He becomes leader of the Liberals against the Conservatives, who are of course first of all Catholics. Towards the very end, just before Cæsar's defeat and retirement, there is a dialogue between Cæsar and a Father Martin, who speaks for his party, which sums up the situation from two points of view. Cæsar speaks:

"'To you Castro's moral and intellectual state seems good, does it not?'

"'Yes.'

"'Well, to me it seems horrifying. . . . This state of things that you find admirable seems to me bestially fanatical, repugnantly immoral, repulsively vile.'

"'Of course, for you are a pessimist about things as they are, like any good revolutionist. You believe that you are going to improve life at Castro? You alone?'

"'I, united with others.'

"'And meanwhile you introduce anarchy into the city.'

"'I introduce anarchy! No. I introduce order. I want to finish with the anarchy already reigning in Castro and make it submit to a thought, to a worthy, noble thought.'

"'And by what right do you arrogate to yourself the power to do this?'

"'By the right of being the stronger.'

"'Ah! Good! If you should get to be the weaker, you ought not to complain if we should misuse our strength.'

"'Complain! When you have been misusing it for thousands of years! At this very moment, we do the talking, we make the protests, but you people give the orders.'

"'We offset your idiotic behavior. We stand in the way of your Utopias. Do you think you are going to solve the problem of this earth, and that of Capital? Are you going to solve the sexual question? Are you going to institute a society without inequality or injustice? . . . To me it seems very difficult.'

"'To me, too. But that is what there is to try for.'"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

WREYLAND is a hamlet of six houses, on the Wrey, a little stream in Devonshire; and Mr. Cecil Torr, the owner of one of the houses, has amused himself during the latter years of the war by jotting down his reminiscences of things seen and heard in the hamlet. His little book, "Small Talk at Wreyland" (Cambridge University Press), was meant for private circulation only, to preserve among the author's circle of acquaintances those memories and traditions that are so often lost for want of being written down. Only when the book was actually in print was Mr. Torr persuaded to offer it to a larger public. And it is well that he did so, for the small-talk (some of it frankly very small indeed) is charmingly redolent of old England. One gets continually a sense of unbroken historic tradition. Climb a hill near Wreyland and in your wide view over the lovely Devon landscape only four dwellings can be seen, yet all four are mentioned in the Doomsday Book: Wooley (Vluclei), Pullabrook (Polebroch), Hawksmere (Hauocmore), and Elsford (Eilauesford). These were the homes of four Saxon thanes in the time of Edward the Confessor. A friend of the author's is descended from William the Conqueror on both father's and mother's side, by twenty-seven and twenty-four generations respectively. As a boy, Mr. Torr talked with an old man who told him of the execution of Charles the First as he had heard it from another senior who had heard it from an eyewitness. Mr. Torr has heard in the same way the story of the fire of London, at only two removes from a child who saw the destruction of the old city. An ancestor of the author's is said to have been present at Widdicome Church when the Devil entered with "a crash of thunder, lightning, hail, and fire and a sulphurous smell." "What would you have done," the writer's grandfather asked a sturdy man of Devon, "if you had been there when the Devil came in?" "Dock'n, master, dock'n; cut the tail of'n off," was the heroic reply; one remembers Dunstan and his famous treatment of the Devil who ventured uninvited into the saint's smithy. But the Devil, after all, is a mediæval figure. There are superstitions still current in Wreyland that run back to primeval paganism. A goblin sits by night on the Bishop's Stone, less than a mile from Mr. Torr's home. Fairies and pixies haunt the woods and gardens—and one can tell them apart, for fairies wear clothes and pixies go without. It is recorded as a fact of the writer's own experience that less than twenty years ago a child born with a rupture was "put through a tree" to effect a cure. Some of the best stories in the book are in the Devon speech, with its own peculiar syntax. The natives never say "we are," but always "us be" or "we'm." Nominatives and objectives are interchanged with a freer license than even Shakespeare allowed himself. The classic phrase, we are informed, is "her told she"; and a pious person speaking of Christ to the writer remarked: "Us didn't love He, 'twas Him loved us." Altogether, this is a book to be commended, without hesitation or reserve, to every lover of old England.

THE Great War and the problems of peace and reconstruction in Europe have crowded the Far East out of the place it held in general interest between 1900 and 1914. Yet questions have arisen there which should be understood by everyone who would be well informed. A book which, therefore, is timely and of peculiar helpfulness is Dr. Arthur Judson Brown's "The Mastery of the Far East" (Scribners). "The general idea of this book is that the Korean Peninsula is the strategic point in the mastery of the Far East." Thus, the first part, containing six chapters, deals with Old Korea; the second part, seven chapters, with the struggle of China, Japan, and Russia for the control of the peninsula; the third part, fifteen chapters, with the rise of Japan as an imperial power in the Far East; and the last part, eleven chapters, with the place of Christian missions in the problems of that region. The most striking feature of the volume is the constant endeavor of the author to understand and present both sides of every controversial question which must be considered. Anyone who is at all familiar with the recent literature on the Far East will know how small is the category of books which deserves this comment. Dr. Brown has been for years the Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. In that capacity he has been in constant touch with men who are among the best informed of all the foreigners in Japan, Korea, and China. He has twice visited the East, and gone over the ground with these well-qualified advisers. It is but natural that from these informants he would receive warmly sympathetic statements of the merits of their respective countries in the many controversies which have recently arisen. But so judicial is the author's temperament that he has avoided all evidence of partisanship in his discussion. This is especially true of his treatment of certain political questions arising out of mission work in Korea and Japan. There is much in the volume which would help one understand the fundamental problems involved in the Sino-Japanese controversy, the Siberian intervention, the political and social evolution of Japan. But especially helpful at this moment is the discussion of Japan's work in Korea. Dr. Brown accepts the reasons for the Japanese occupation of Korea. On the whole, he believes that Japan has done a creditable piece of work there. In spite of certain faults he believes "the balance inclines heavily in favor of the Japanese." And although he sympathizes "with the natural aspirations of any people for an independent nationality" it is his opinion that "the Koreans could not be independent anyway under present conditions in the Far East, and they are far better off under the Japanese than they were under their own rulers or than they would have been under the Russians." He also explains the connection between the Christian movement in Korea and the revolutionary propaganda, and he narrates in considerable detail a number of incidents which gave color to the belief among the Japanese authorities that the Korean missions were shelters for revolutionists, and account for the many references to missions and missionaries in the recent dispatches from Korea. But his understanding of the problems which the Japanese have had to face does not prevent him from criticizing in frank but kindly fashion certain methods of the ruling class. All in all, "The Mastery of the Far East" contains much that is informing, much that is suggestive. It should prove invaluable to anyone who would form well-reasoned opinions concerning the present situation in what is still one of the danger-zones of the world.

IT is the pride of the British Navy to be known as the Silent Service. The British are a tongue-tied race; and, like all men of action, the British naval officer prefers deeds to words. There is danger of his being, like Coriolanus, the grave of his own deserving. But an interpreter has been found in "Bartimeus," an officer in the Pay Department, whose defective eyesight made an executive post impossible. He knows the Navy from within, and he also knows how to write. In Britain he is recognized as the spokesman of the Fleet, and he deserves to be better known on this side of the water. In his latest book, "The Navy Eternal" (Doran), his material is epic. Such themes as the Battle of Jutland, the attack on Zeebrugge, the fierce five-minute fight of the Swift and the Broke, the vengeance taken for the sinking of seven trawlers in the Dover patrol, the Mary Rose's defence of her convoy against three light cruisers, the loss of the Shark, would inspire far less able pens. To the coming peaceful world lapped in universal law, the record may well seem fabulous. But such things were, and "Bartimeus" tells of them with great plainness of speech. Adjectives, "fine writing," the tricks of rhetoric, would affront these exploits and the men who dared and died. The simple word, the understatement, suffice. There are moving pages in this book. It is not the fact of death that stirs the fountain of tears, but the courage which faces death in its most horrible forms unflinching and undismayed. In the epilogue, a naval officer reconstructs the tragedy of a submarine crew found drowned

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in their crazy shell. Such things are too deep for tears. Americans will read with just pride the tribute of "Bartimeus" to the marvellous efficiency of their own battle-squadron. There were many obstacles in the way of coöperating with the British, such as the difference in the two systems of signals; but they were overcome with incredible rapidity. The story of the "Christmas ship" will be new even to the well-informed. It should be known throughout the length and breadth of the land, to let our people see into the heart of the sailor man, and to make them realize once more that "the bravest are the tenderest."

A YEAR or two ago Captain Francis Brett Young gave us, in "Marching on Tanga," a chronicle of strenuous days and deeds in what might be called the chief side-show of the Great War, the German East Africa campaign. That chronicle is a work of art; it is written in a prose that is full of life and color and music. In a novel entitled "The Crescent Moon" (Dutton) the author now combines the characteristic excellences of his earlier work. The scene of this story is laid in the East African Highlands, which Captain Young knows as well as any man living, and the evocation of the spirit of place is consummately well done. There is scarcely room here to rehearse the progress of the tale, which deals with the tragic vicissitudes of Eva Burwarton and her unsophisticated but profoundly serious evangelist brother, who go out from the placid loveliness and domestic pieties of a Shropshire village to meet with disillusionment and ultimate disaster at the mission house of Luguru on the awful edge of the M'ssente swamp. From the first page to the last a delicate psychological discernment plays lambently upon the persons of the drama, with the polished blue enamel of the Afric sky serving as a gorgeous back-drop throughout the action. Some of the descriptions of the African scene are extraordinarily beautiful; and in the skill with which the nocturnal deviltry of the sacrifice at the Hill of the Moon is suggested, there is more than a reminiscence of the mysterious horror of Conrad's "Heart of Darkness."

Making Americans

FATHER O'GRADY, who, it may be said, is largely responsible for the far-sighted reconstruction programme of the National Catholic War Council, sharply criticized the chair, at the recent four-days conference on Americanization in Washington, for excluding representatives of labor from such a gathering, at a time when organized labor is showing so vital an interest in educational problems. The rather lame reply of the director of Americanization for the Interior Department—that Samuel Gompers had been invited, but that his recent accident had prevented American Federation of Labor representation—emphasized the difference in attitude between officialdom and the broader-minded educators and social workers. The meetings revealed a conviction on the part of the Department of the Interior that Americanization is primarily a new bulwark to maintain the old order inviolate, while to a majority of the two hundred delegates this was obviously unimportant compared with the sincere desire to broaden the avenues of opportunity for our foreign-born. Small progress in Americanizing these citizens will be made until their tenement environment in industrial centres has been brought up to an American standard, as John Ihlder, of the Philadelphia Housing Association, expressed it. There was warm support for Father O'Grady when he declared that "the immigrant has some reason for failing to recognize the idealism of a country which has often exploited him abominably, surrounded him with intolerable conditions, and generally refused him even the fundamentals of industrial democracy."

The official viewpoint, on the other hand, was brought out by Secretary Lane, who said:

"We have no apologies to make for what it [the United States] is. This is no land in which to spread any doctrine of revolution, because we have abolished revolution. When we came here we gave over the right of revolution. You cannot have revolution in a land unless you have somebody to revolt against, and whom would you revolt against in the United States—who is there to revolt against? The people of the United States. And when we won our revolution one hundred and forty years ago we then said, We give over that inherent right of revolution because there can be no such thing as revolution against a country where the people govern."

A vital part of the conference was the unanimous, almost pathetic, plea for a centralized programme to prevent wasted and overlapping effort, made by the representatives of various welfare agencies, such as the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the National Catholic War Council, the Council of Jewish Women, civic organizations, women's organizations, churches, public libraries, visiting nurses, boys' and girls' organizations, parents' and teachers' associations, neighborhood settlement houses, and domestic science workers. This also was the theme of George L. Bell, former secretary of the War Labor Policies Board, who urged the national Government to "establish one central agency or department charged with full power and responsibility for the development and execution of a broad national Americanization programme, carried out in coöperation with the States."

Mr. Bell presented to the conference the California State Immigration Commission's proposals for a national programme of Americanization, which, it should be noted, is based on removing from the foreigner four oppressions—"Fraud, impossible labor conditions, bad housing, and the unknown tongue."

The elimination of the last of these "oppressions" occupied the attention of the conference as much as the first three put together. Instruction in the English language in all schools was advocated as the fundamental step by Commissioner of Education Claxton and the other speakers. Many valuable suggestions were put forward for increasing the efficiency of the public school as the great American solvent, all tending to the thesis that the public school should be developed into the community centre where alien adults, as well as alien children, should find the gateway to merging in the body politic. Special morning and afternoon classes for alien mothers were strongly recommended by F. V. Thompson and S. E. Weber, superintendents of schools of Boston and Scranton. The failure of the night school to reach the foreign-born housewife was also pointed out.

The value of factory schools in any Americanization programme was emphasized by several plant representatives and welfare experts, but in view of the strange neglect to summon labor to the conference this phase of the discussion was manifestly one-sided. "Industry is the vital factor in the whole scheme of Americanization," declared Charles H. Paull of Harvard University, who has had experience in this work with industrial firms. He made plain, however, that in his opinion such Americanization should be from the top down, with chambers of commerce filling an advisory rôle.

In refreshing contrast to an over-emphasis of "one hundred per cent. Americanism" in matters cultural was the theme of Burdette Lewis, Commissioner of Charities and Corrections of Trenton, N. J. While he agrees that our eagle is a noble bird, he wants it remembered that the nightingale, though a stranger to our shores, has a sweeter voice. "Too often," he said, "Italian children, learning our ragtime, are assisted to forget the glory of their native music; Irish children, studying our literature, have blotted from their minds the beauty of their own." Fortunately others, too, spoke out their belief that America can learn much from her immigrants.

That Americanization work will be universally unsuccessful unless its proponents realize that the immigrant is a human being with feelings like the rest of us was generally recognized from the floor of the conference. An exception to this attitude seemed to exist in the mind of Miss Harriet Dow, of the Yorkville Neighborhood Association, New York City, who advocated making Americanization work so "stylish" that ladies who have been engaged in war activities and now find time heavy on their hands may be induced to assist in it.

FELIX MORLEY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chemistry, Physics, and War

TWO important features of the recent meeting of the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia were a symposium on the solar eclipse of June 8, 1918, and one on chemical warfare. In the former, special attention was given to the exhibition and interpretation of photographs of the prominences and the coronal arches and streamers, obtained by members of the several expeditions sent from the Lick, the Mount Wilson, the Lowell, the Sproul, and the Yerkes Observatories. Several conspicuous prominences were shown, and these were generally surrounded by complex coronal structure. These coronal arches or "hoods" are probably among the most notable and remarkable that have so far been photographed. As a result of a study of these observations, there seems to be no doubt as to the intimate relation between the prominences and the surrounding coronal structure. From the comparison of the observations of earlier eclipses made at different epochs of solar activity it seems probable that complex coronal detail and disturbed regions of the corona around the prominences are more pronounced near sunspot maxima.

The symposium on chemical warfare was most impressive as indicating the enormous quantities of poisonous gases—phosgene, mustard, and chlorpicrin—made by this country and shipped to Europe to fight the enemy with his own weapons. Col. M. T. Bogert, who was in charge of the general Chemical Warfare Service, gave a brief historical introduction. He was followed by Col. F. M. Dorsey, who spoke on "Chemical Warfare and Manufacturing Development," while Col. W. H. Walker made an inspiring address on "Production of Chemical Warfare Munitions." Col. Bradley Dewey treated in detail our means of defence against the deadly gases used in war, and told how over five million gas masks were made in eight months and sent overseas with nearly three million canisters for holding the absorbing chemicals, and how these chemicals were obtained. One item included four hundred tons a day of cocoanut shells and peach stones for producing the fine charcoal necessary for making gas masks.

A paper on "Detection of Submarines" by Dr. H. C. Hayes, who was stationed at the Naval Experimental Station at New London, discussed various possible methods. The most effective one resulted from the development of a system of multiple sound-sensitive receivers mounted in such a way as to transmit to both ears of the observer a cumulative or summational impulse which becomes a maximum when the instrument is properly directed, thus showing the direction of the submarine. It is clear that such an instrument would be valuable in peace times also in indicating the presence and direction of vessels in a fog.

Col. Augustus Trowbridge, recently attached to General Pershing's Staff and in charge of the Sound Ranging Service of the A. E. F., analyzed the work of this remarkably successful service. The location of active enemy batteries and of the direction of fire from friendly guns by means of sound is new, while that by visual means, flash ranging, is an outgrowth and extension of standard artillery methods. A sound-ranging section was in the field with the first American Division, March, 1918, while on the date of the armistice the entire front of the second American Army was covered by both flash and sound ranging sections. The central or calculating station, situated generally in a dugout or ruined house, was more elaborate than in the case of the flash because of the greater instrumental installation of the sound-ranging section. The central instrument recorded photographically the time of arrival of the sound of the enemy guns at a series of instruments at surveyed positions near the front line and covering a length of about five miles. This instrument delivered automatically developed and fixed photographic records in less than a minute after the sound of the enemy gun reached the front line.

ARTHUR W. GOODSPEED

Drama

A Note on Tragedy

IT has been said many times, and always with an air of authority, that there is no tragedy in the modern drama. And since tragedy, in the minds of most educated people, is hazily but quite firmly connected with the mishaps of noble and mythical personages, the statement has been widely accepted as true. Thus very tawdry Shakespearean revivals are received with a traditional reverence for the sternest and noblest of all the art-forms that is consciously withheld from "Ghosts" or "Justice" or "The Weavers." Placid people in college towns consider these plays painful. They hasten to pay their respects to awkward chantings of Gilbert Murray's Swinburnian verses and approve the pleasant mildness of the pity and terror native to the Attic stage. The very innocuousness of these entertainments as well as the pain that Ibsen and Hauptmann inflict should give them pause. Pity and terror are strong words and stand for strong things. But our public replies in the comfortable words of its most respectable critics that tragedy has ceased to be written.

These critics reveal a noteworthy state of mind. They are aware that tragedy cuts to the quick of life and springs from the innermost depth of human thinking because it must always seek to deal in some intelligible way with the problem of evil. But since it is most comfortable to believe that problem to have been solved, they avert their faces from a reopening of the eternal question and declare that the answer of the Greeks and the Elizabethans is final. They are also aware, though more dimly, that all tragedy involves moral judgments. And since they are unaccustomed to make such judgments, except by the light of standards quite rigid and quite antecedent to experience, they are bewildered by a type of tragic drama that transfers its crises from the deeds of men to the very criteria of moral judgment, from guilt under a law to the arraignment of the law itself.

"Macbeth" represents in art and life their favorite tragic situation. They can understand a gross and open crime meeting a violent punishment. When, as in "King Lear," the case is not so plain, they dwell long and emphatically on the old man's weaknesses in order to find satisfaction in his doom. In the presence of every tragic protagonist of the modern drama they are tempted to play the part of Job's comforters. They are eager to impute to him an absoluteness of guilt which shall, by implication, justify their own moral world and the doctrine of moral violence by which they live. The identical instinct which in war causes men to blacken the enemy's character in order to justify their tribal rage and hate, persuades the conventional critic to deny the character of tragedy to every action in which disaster does not follow upon crime. Yet, rightly looked upon, man in every tragic situation is a Job, incapable and unconscious of any degree of voluntary guilt that can justify a suffering as sharp and constant as his own.

Thus modern tragedy does not deal with wrong and just vengeance, which are both, if conceived absolutely, pure fictions of our deep-rooted desire for superiority and violence. It is inspired by compassion. But compassion without complacency is still, alas, a very rare emotion. And it seeks to derive the tragic element in human life from the mistakes and self-imposed compulsions, not from the sins, of men. The central idea of "Ghosts," for instance, is not concerned with the sin of the father that is visited upon the son. It is concerned, as Ibsen sought to make abundantly clear, with Mrs. Alving's fatal conformity to a social tradition that did not represent the pureness of her will. Her tragic mistake arises from her failure to break the law. The ultimate and absolute guilt is in the blind, collective lust of mankind for the formulation and indiscriminate enforcement of external laws.

To such a conception of the moral world, tragedy has but

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recently attained. That both the critical and the public intelligence should lag far behind is inevitable. Every morning's paper proclaims a world whose moral pattern is formed of terrible blacks and glaring whites. How should people gladly endure the endless and pain-touched gray of modern tragedy? They understand the Greek conception of men who violated the inscrutable will of gods; they understand the Renaissance conception that a breach of the universal moral law, sanctioned and set forth by God, needed to be punished. They can even endure such situations as that of Claudio and Isabella in the terrible third act of "Measure for Measure." For that unhappy brother and sister never question the right of the arbitrary power that caused so cruel a dilemma, nor doubt the absolute validity of the virtue that is named. These two strike at each other's hearts and never at the bars of the monstrous cage that holds them prisoner. Do they not, therefore, rise almost to the dignity of symbols of that moral world in which the majority of men still live?

But it is precisely with the bars of the cage that modern tragedy is so largely and necessarily concerned. It cannot deal with guilt in the older sense. For guilt involves an absolute moral judgment. That, in its turn, involves an absolute standard. And a literally absolute standard is unthinkable without a super-human sanction. Even such a sanction, however, would leave the flexible and enlightened spirit in the lurch. For if it were not constantly self-interpretative by some method of progressive and objectively embodied revelation, its interpretation would again become a mere matter of human opinion, and the absoluteness of moral guilt would again be gravely jeopardized. Not only must God have spoken; He would need to speak anew each day. The war has overwhelmingly illustrated how infinitely alien such obvious reflections still are to the temper of humanity. We must have guilt. Else how, without utter shame, could we endure punitive prisons and gibbets and battles? Is it surprising that audiences are cold to Ibsen and Hauptmann and Galsworthy, and that good critics who are also righteous and angry men deny their plays the character of tragedy?

But the bars of the absolutist cage are not so bright and firm as they were once. The conception of unrelieved guilt and overwhelming vengeance has just played on the stage of history a part so monstrous that its very name will ring to future ages with immitigable contrition and grief. And thus in the serener realm of art the modern idea of tragedy is very sure to make its gradual appeal to the hearts of men. Guilt and punishment will be definitely banished to melodrama, where they belong. Tragedy will seek increasingly to understand our failures and our sorrows. It will excite pity for our common fate; the terror it inspires will be a terror lest we wrong our brother or violate his will, not lest we share his guilt and incur his punishment. It will seek its final note of reconciliation not by delivering another victim to an outraged God or an angry tribe, but through a profound sense of that community of human suffering which all force deepens and all freedom assuages.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

Finance

Revival of Bond Trading

THE country has begun to purchase bonds again, and it looks as if there would be a good July bond market. This is the season when the re-investment of the semi-annual dividend and interest fund is usually arranged for. Around the first of July, something like $200,000,000 will be disbursed by all classes of corporations, including Governments, States, and municipalities. The closing days of June are, therefore, likely to see spirited trading in bonds unless the re-investment demand is held up by unsettling influences.

The instant success of the Victory Loan has been an important incident in the revival of Wall Street bond trading. The increased inquiry has not been at all spectacular, but of late there has been a definite broadening of the investment demand with purchases of safe investment issues by that large contingent of American investors who were unable to obtain as many Victory Bonds as they applied for. The over-subscriptions for the Government loan were large, notwithstanding the fears expressed in many quarters during the recent campaign that the offering would not be fully taken. The bonds have been well placed and the probability is that most of them will be permanently lodged with bona-fide investors.

Announcement that the Government issue had been liberally over-subscribed had a reassuring effect upon the investing public, with the result that many cautious investors determined to purchase other securities when they discovered that they would not be able to obtain a full allotment of Victory bonds. Nothing succeeds like success, in the bond market as in everything else, and the Government's bond-selling campaign showed that many subscribers would probably have been glad to increase their subscriptions as soon as it was known definitely that the great issue had been largely over-applied for.

It is of the utmost importance to the country that the bond market should show a broadened tendency with increased absorption by the investing public. There are hundreds of municipalities and corporations in need of funds, and the sooner these legitimate demands are satisfied the easier it will be to revive business and restore confidence in all branches of industry. Throughout the war it was necessary for the Government to have first call upon the bond market and to force private borrowers to curtail outlays that were not imperatively required. A vast amount of business was held up in this way, and for several months it was virtually impossible for legitimate borrowers to obtain the funds that they required, except in instances where the demand could not be deferred. It follows, therefore, that a large amount of financing remains to be done as soon as the investment markets can provide the funds.

The banks will still have to make large advances to the Government, however, in connection with the winding up of the country's military enterprise.

WILLIAM JUSTUS BOIES

YVETTE

AND OTHER STORIES

By GUY DE MAUPESSANT

Translated by

MRS. JOHN GALSWORTHY

With an Introduction by

JOSEPH CONRAD

¶ *A novelette and ten short stories. Fourth American Edition.* *$1.60 at bookshops*

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 W. Forty-second St., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Barclay, Thomas. Collapse and Reconstruction. Little, Brown. $2.50.
Brown, Louise F. The Freedom of the Seas. Dutton. $2.
Cleveland, Frederick A., and Schafer, Joseph, editors. Democracy in Reconstruction. Houghton Mifflin. $2.50.
Daniels, Josephus. The Navy and the Nation. Doran. $2.
Erzberger, M. The League of Nations. Holt. $2.25.
Fisher, Fred B. India's Silent Revolution. Macmillan. $1.50.
Fisk, Harvey E. Our Public Debt. New York: Bankers Trust Company.
Gauvin, Auguste. La Question Yougoslave. Paris: Bossard.
Grieves, Loren C. The New Grand Army of the Republic. Doran. 50 cents.
Kellogg, Paul U., and Gleason, Arthur. British Labor and the War. Boni & Liveright. $2.
Leverhulme, Lord. The Six-Hour Day and Other Industrial Questions. Holt. $3.50.
Moore, William H. The Clash: A Study in Nationalities. Dutton.
Phelan, John J. Pool, Billiards and Bowling Alleys. Toledo: Little Book Press. $1.50.
Sweetser, Arthur. The American Air Service. Appleton. $2.50.
Thayer, William R. Democracy, Discipline, and Peace. Houghton Mifflin. $1.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Adams, George P. Idealism and the Modern Age. Yale Press. $2.50.
Anonymous. God's Son. London: Cornish Bros.
Anonymous. The Fourth Dimension. London: C. W. Daniel.
Burney, C. F. Israel's Settlement in Canaan. Oxford Press. $1.60.
Cunningham, W. The Secret of Progress. Cambridge Press.
Frank, Henry. The Challenge of the War. Boston: Stratford Co. $2.50.
Fullerton, Kemper. Prophecy and Authority. Macmillan. $1.50.
Howe, Julia W. The Walk with God. Dutton. $1.50.
Joseph, Morris. Judaism as Creed and Life. Macmillan. $2.
Kadison, Alexander. Through Agnostic Spectacles. New York: Truth Seeker Co. $1.
Keith, A. Berriedale. The Sāmkhya System of Philosophy. Oxford Press. 70 cents.
Lewis, Frank G. How the Bible Grew. University of Chicago Press. $1.50.
Marks, Jeanette. Courage. Woman's Press. $1.25.
Robertson, A. T. Studies in Mark's Gospel. Macmillan. $1.25.
Scott, J. W. Syndicalism and Philosophical Realism. London: Black.
Sorley, W. R. Spinoza. Oxford Press.
Speer, Robert E. The New Opportunity of the Church. Macmillan. 60 cents.

MISCELLANEOUS

Abbott, Samuel. The Dramatic Story of Old Glory. Boni & Liveright. $1.60.
Dunton, William R. Reconstruction Therapy. Philadelphia: Saunders.
Haigh, Richmond. An Ethiopian Saga. Holt. $1.30.
McMahon, John R., editor. How These Farmers Succeeded. Holt. $1.40.
Mercier, Charles. Crime and Criminals. Holt. $2.50
"Palestine": A Periodical; Volumes 1, 2 and 3 Manchester: John Heywood.
United States National Museum: Report for the Year Ending June 30, 1918. Government Printing Office.

Lord Leverhulme's

The Six Hour Day

And Other Industrial Questions

With an introduction by Viscount Haldane. $3.50 net.

The opinions of this great capitalist and industrial leader on the relations between capital and labor are not only advanced, but eminently sane. He has experimented successfully in his own great plants with the six-hour working day, profit-sharing, etc., and here sets forth his own views on such matters and the results of his experiments.

J. H. MacKinder's

Democratic Ideals and Reality

$2.00 net.

A discussion of the geographical and consequent trade basis of a lasting peace and of the manner in which these realities are related to the realization of our ideals of freedom. It will appeal to the general reader not only for its timeliness and its treatment of the broad outlines of commercial and industrial geography, but for the delightful clarity of its style.

Henry Holt & Company

Publishers of THE UNPOPULAR REVIEW, New York

For the sum of Three Dollars any American can now subscribe for a year to

"COMMON SENSE"

L O N D O N

It is a weekly newspaper containing European news not elsewhere found.

It is edited by F. W. Hirst and represents an important body of independent

Liberal and Labour Opinion in England

Subscriptions may be sent either to the Office of the "NATION," 20 Vesey Street, New York, or direct to the Manager, "COMMON SENSE," 44, Essex Street, Strand, London, W. C. 2.

KING HENRY THE FIFTH

Edited by Robert D. French, M.A.

Library Edition just published. Cloth, $1.00.

(The Yale Shakespeare)

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

120 College Street, New Haven, Connecticut. 280 Madison Avenue, New York City.

THE MODERN LIBRARY

OF THE WORLD'S BEST BOOKS

Sixty-four titles now published.

Only 70c. a volume. Catalogue on request.

BONI & LIVERIGHT, 109 W. 40th St., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNIVERSITY of MANITOBA
Winnipeg, Canada

The Board of Governors invite applications for the following appointments:

Assistant-Professor of Chemistry, with special qualifications in Physical Chemistry. Initial salary for this grade of appointment, $2100. (Applications in this instance from candidates who stipulate a minimum salary up to $2500 will be considered.)

Assistant-Professor of Political Economy, to contribute generally to the work of the department but preferably with special qualifications in Economic History and Commerical Geography. Initial salary $2100.

Lecturer in Botany, to assist generally in the work of the department and carry on research. Initial salary, $1600.

Lecturer in Zoology, to assist generally in the work of the department and carry on research. Initial salary, $1600.

Assistant in Physiology, with special qualifications in Experimental Physiology, salary $1200.

Ten copies, typewritten or printed, of letter of application and testimonials should be in the hands of the undersigned, in the case of the Assistant-Professorship in Chemistry by May 31st; in the case of the Lectureship in Zoology, the Assistantship in Physiology and the Assistant Professorship in Political Economy, by July 7th, and in the case of the Lectureship in Botany by July 15th.

The successful candidates will be expected to enter upon their new duties about September 1st, 1919.

The Secretary, Board of Governors,
University of Manitoba,
Winnipeg, CANADA.

WOMEN AND THE LABOUR PARTY

Indispensable to a comprehension of woman's place in the new social order. By the ten leading women of England. Introduction by Arthur Henderson.

(At good bookstores, 50c.)

Published by B. W. HUEBSCH *New York*

A GENTLE CYNIC
Being the Book of Ecclesiastes

By MORRIS JASTROW, Jr., Ph.D., LL.D. Author of "The War and the Bagdad Railway," etc. Small 4to. $2.00 net

A delightfully human book on the Omar Khayyam of the Bible with an exact translation of the original text. How it came to be written and who wrote it (and it was not Solomon), why additions were made to the original text and the whole interesting story is here given.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY - Philadelphia

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him, and The Nation.

Convention and Revolt in Poetry

By JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES

A discussion of Poetry, and particularly of the newer forms of poetry, as unacademic in tone as it is authoritative in substance. $1.75 net.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, Boston

More Than Paper and Ink

We mix brains with our printer's ink. The result is work which appeals to thinking people. If you want more than mere mechanical printing, try The Nation Press for your next piece of salesmanship on paper.

THE NATION PRESS, Inc.
20 Vesey Street Barclay 9092

Labour in the Commonwealth
By G. D. H. Cole, M. A.

5s. 11d. post free

Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Author of "The World of Labour," "Labour In War-Time," "Self-Government in Industry," "Introduction to Trade Unionism," etc.

"Those who wish to understand the spirit and faith of this generation of economic investigators (which it is interesting to compare with those of the Benthamites, the Christian Socialists, The Positivists and the Fabians of the last century) must read this volume—perhaps the best that Mr. Cole has yet written. Very instructive is Mr. Cole's exposition of the essential humanity of what economists and employers persist in thinking of as "Labour"; very interesting is his analysis of the State as only one of many communities of which we simultaneously form parts, and not necessarily the most important of them."—*The New Statesman.*

The Religion of Experience
By Edward Grubb, M. A.

5s. 6d. post free

Author of "What is Quakerism?" and other works.

"There is a close relation between the experimental note in Religion and that of Science, which in our own day has changed not only the outward face of human life, but men's whole conception of the universe and their methods of thought. The man of science insists on verification—on bringing every theory or doctrine to the test of facts that can be observed and described. The modern religious teacher equally insists that the doctrines of his faith arose out of experience—out of what men actually felt, and thought they knew, of God; and that if we are to understand and appreciate these doctrines, or even criticise them to any purpose, we must ourselves come into the place of experience."—*Extract from first chapter.*

Headley Bros., *Publishers*, Ltd.
72 Oxford Street, W. 1. London, England

Felix Adler

Discusses Questions of the Day in

The Standard

A magazine published to promote Ethical thinking and to encourage better ways of living.

ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR
(9 Issues)

Sample copies free on application to

Publication Department
American Ethical Union
2 West 64th Street, New York City

Georges Clemenceau:
Tiger of France By Georges Lecomte

An intimate study of the Grand Old Man of France, of his career, his vigorous personality, and remarkable popularity, as a writer, orator and patriot. $1.50 net.

THIS IS AN APPLETON BOOK

The Harper Columbia Books That Sing
THE BUBBLE BOOKS
By RALPH MAYHEW & BURGES JOHNSON
$1.00 Each
HARPER & BROTHERS
Established 1817.

ARISTODEMOCRACY
From the Great War Back to Moses, Christ and Plato
By SIR CHARLES WALSTON
New and Cheaper Edition with a Second American Preface

"It would be a great mistake for practical politicians to brush aside summarily proposals of this nature on the ground that they are unpractical, and can only be regarded as the dreams of Utopian idealists. Not only moralists and thinkers, but also the general mass of the public, are yearning for the discovery of some means to prevent future wars and to relieve the heavy burden of taxation due to the maintenance of enormous armaments."—Lord Cromer in *The Spectator.*

8vo. $1.50 *net. Postage extra.*

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
FOURTH AVE. AND 30TH ST., NEW YORK

Social Justice, demanded

by the labor commission at the Peace Conference, is discussed in T. N. Carver's "Essays in Social Justice" under such heads as "How Much Is a Man Worth?" "Socialism and the Present Unrest," and the like. It is a sturdy book for vigorous thinkers; price $2.00 at all bookstores.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
29 Randall Hall, Cambridge Mass.
280 Madison Ave., New York City

HOTEL PURITAN
390 Commonwealth Ave.
BOSTON

Solicits the patronage of readers of the Nation.

Globe-trotters say the Puritan is one of the most homelike and attractive hotels in the world.

Wholly reasonable rates.

Send for our booklet with its guide to Boston and its historic vicinity.

N. A. COSTELLO, Manager.

Witness
THE REVOLT
against
SENTIMENTAL SCRUPLES
in
THE SOCK By DON ORNO

A Play of Protest in One Act

Postpaid 25c. Published by

The Three Pamphleteers
1004 Eastern Parkway Brooklyn, N. Y.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY *of* CALIFORNIA

Monographs and separates in Sciences, Economics, History, Philology, Philosophy, etc.

List of titles and prices free on request.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Berkeley, Cal. 280 Madison Ave., N. Y.

"A Wonderful Book."—*Chicago Daily News*
BLIND ALLEY By W. L. GEORGE

"Blind Alley" is an extraordinary novel. But it is more than that. It is a cry in the night."—*Chicago Daily News.*

431 pages. $1.75 net.

LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Publishers, Boston

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1919 No. 2813

The Recognition of Kolchak: Three Opinions

I. Kolchak "Democracy"

By GEORGE V. LOMONOSSOFF

AT the end of March, 1918, at the time when I had not as yet broken with the so-called Embassy of Bakhmeteff and when nothing was known of England's active interference in Russian affairs, a well-known Russian General, Dobrjansky, called on me at Washington with his aide-de-camp, Captain Martini, one of my former students. They had just arrived from London in company with an English lord, whose name I cannot recall, and in a few days they were to sail for Vladivostok. After a lengthy foreword, they explained to me that the Allies had decided, as a counter-balance to the Soviet Government, to create in Siberia a third Provisional Government with Admiral Kolchak at its head, and they offered me the post of Minister of Ways of Communication in that Government.

At that time innumerable more or less fantastic schemes and plots to aid the Russian counter-revolutionists were already the order of the day in certain circles, and I did not pay particular attention to this proposition. Declining the offer, I told the gentlemen that their scheme was impossible, and that an attempt to realize it would lead to nothing but greater chaos. To this Captain Martini replied hotly that the British Government had decided to support by all means and methods the Government which they were to create, even to sending an army of a million men. Therefore, the success of the enterprise was fully guaranteed. In proof of this, Egypt and India were brought to my attention as examples. I refused the offer a second time, but Captain Martini did not surrender and insisted that I should meet the English lord somewhere on neutral territory. I refused a third time, and finally; and owing to the multitude of events that followed, I had forgotten the incident entirely.

Later, when Kolchak appeared on the political stage as the "selected" leader of the "All-Russian Committee of Restoration of Russia," and now that desperate attempts are being made to make him appear the standard-bearer of democracy and the chosen leader of the Russian people, I recall that incident, and I place it before you as an illustration of the way in which "All-Russian Governments" and "chosen leaders" of the Russian people originate.

I know Kolchak personally. He is an outspoken monarchist, deeply convinced that the Russian people can be ruled only with an iron fist, and without sentimental or "democratic" scruples. He is a very able man, and relentless, which makes him much more dangerous.

The American press today is swamped with propaganda depicting Kolchak as the very incarnation of democratic ideals. Apparently without any sense of humor, the press dispatches state that the Allied Governments are prepared to recognize Admiral Kolchak as the all-Russian authority because the present Government of Russia is not a sufficiently democratic institution to warrant recognition. Once more the press dispatches count upon the ability of the public to forget facts. Some persons, however, will remember that when the so-called Russian Government first was organized with Kolchak as a part of it, it contained members belonging to some moderate Socialist groups. Although these groups were bitterly opposed to the Bolsheviki they did not suit Admiral Kolchak's notions of democracy. Kolchak brutally arrested members of his own so-called Government, among them Avksentiev and Zenzinov.

Kolchak's rule in Siberia has been marked by appalling brutality and organized terror, beside which the most exaggerated stories about the Red Terror in Russia dwindle into insignificance. To prove this one need not rely upon statements from Bolshevist sources. Sufficient evidence has appeared in publications pronouncedly hostile to the Russian Soviet Government.

The March issue of the *Red Cross Magazine* printed a horrible story of a train of death containing hundreds of prisoners taken by the Kolchak forces who were dragged from one end of Siberia to the other end until they succumbed from hunger, cold, and disease.

A most interesting contribution to the characterization of the present rule in Siberia may be found in the June issue of *Hearst's Magazine*. It is written by an American Army Intelligence officer. He frankly admits that 95 per cent. of the people in Siberia are Bolsheviki, and that the counter-revolutionists are able to keep them down only by methods of extreme brutality. He speaks of cases where Kolchak's Cossacks flogged people into unconsciousness with iron rods. He gives instances of indiscriminate executions of people who dared to voice their protest against the régime of Admiral Kolchak.

Recently some self-styled representatives of Russian Cooperatives in the United States came out for the recognition of Kolchak. But the chairman of the American Committee of Russian Coöperatives, who is opposed to the Bolsheviki and therefore cannot be regarded as biased in this matter, states that in coming out for Kolchak the representatives of Siberian coöperatives in no way represented the opinions of the Siberian coöperatives, and that the Siberian cooperative movement, if it were not for the terrorism practised by the Kolchak Goverament, would certainly be the first to oppose his recognition. Yet the fact remains that the Allied Governments, according to reliable dispatches, are on the verge of offering Kolchak recognition.

The reasons given for the Allied opposition to the recognition of the Soviet Government have been, (1) that the Soviet Government is not a democratic form of government, (2) that it maintains itself by terroristic methods, and, (3) that it has not the support of the Russian people. It is evident that the so-called Kolchak Government is indisputably and in the highest degree guilty on all these three counts.

[illegible]TION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Somehow, however, it does not seem to disturb the conscience of those who contemplate his recognition.

The ways of diplomacy are inscrutable indeed.

II. Law and Order Under Kolchak

By GREGORY ZILBOORG

DURING the last few weeks the American press has featured a number of special and semi-official dispatches, dated for the most part from Washington and all referring to "new and fresh forces" and a "new light" arising from Siberia under the "patriotic and democratic" leadership of Admiral Kolchak. These announcements, conspicuously lacking in supporting facts, grow in number daily. It is clear that someone, deeply interested in the Kolchak enterprise, is exerting all available means to influence American public opinion in a definite direction, making use on the one hand of the credulity of the American reader, and on the other of his extremely limited acquaintance with the intricate Russian question. The information issuing from Paris, London, and Washington seems to be intended as a preparation for one of the most important steps in international politics—the recognition of Kolchak as the head of an all-Russian Government—and the public at large hardly realizes what consequences may ensue.

I know well enough the unhealthy methods of political fighting common to our time, and am aware of the fact that anyone who is opposed to Kolchak is branded with the label of Bolshevism and all his opposition is bound to be explained as the result of Bolshevist influence. It seems, therefore, worth while at the start to disown that label. I feel that I am under a moral obligation as one of the little fragments of the last All-Russian Provisional Government, as one who, in spite of the fall of that Government two years ago, has not lost devotion to the Revolution or the hope of seeing a new and united Russia. For this very reason I cannot placidly accept the Siberian reaction advancing under the banner of opposition to Bolshevism.

By the recognition of Kolchak, Europe will make an irreparable blunder and do immeasurable wrong to the whole Russian democracy, which is suffering hunger and losing blood, but which will finally survive and not succumb under the heavy trials of the day. That the Siberian movement is a reactionary movement hiding under anti-Bolshevist attire is easily proven.

1. The Government of Kolchak was not formed by any responsible groups but was born only after the elimination by force of the committee of members of the all-Russian Constituent Assembly.

2. The Government of Kolchak, proclaiming itself the defender of democracy and justice, constantly deports beyond the borders of Russia or murders without trial the representatives of the best social and political tendencies in Russia. So they arrested Avksentiev, Minister of the Interior under Kerensky, and deported Zenzinov and Argunov—all three prominent members of the Constituent Assembly and active opponents of the Bolsheviki. So they shot Kirienko, a member of the Social-Democratic group of Plekhanov and well known as a true Russian patriot; so they murdered the Social Revolutionists, Moiseenko and Novoselov—all opponents of the Bolsheviki.

By the recent public admission in New York of the late chargé d'affaires of the Foreign Ministry of Kolchak we learn that many Russian Socialists and democrats are in Siberian prisons which they left not long ago when the Czar was overthrown. Kolchak "uproots" Bolshevism by systematically destroying the last remnants of the truly democratic forces of Russia, by establishing a new dictatorship of blood and iron.

3. The Government of Kolchak, having purged itself of undesirable elements, consists now of members entirely unknown to the Russian democracy.

4. The Government of Kolchak has as its representative at Paris the old and tried diplomat Sazonov, who is busy negotiating the recognition of Admiral Kolchak in Parisian salons and on political back-stairs, selling outright the Russian Revolution and Russian democracy, against which he fought for so many years under Nicholas II. When interviewed several weeks ago, Sazonov made the statement that autocracy was no longer possible, but that a constitutional monarchy or a democracy of some sort might come. He dared not pronounce the word republic or mention the constituent assembly. Anyone who knows contemporary Russia and who understands the feeling of the masses knows that the whole country, the Bolsheviki and their adversaries alike, will rise as one at the word monarchy, even "constitutional," and pay with more rivers of blood rather than submit. Such are the tendencies in Russia while Kolchak's representative at Paris suavely converses with European diplomats of a monarchy as a possible form of government for the Russian state of tomorrow.

Two questions were asked of the former representative of Kolchak's foreign office during a speech made recently before the Russian colony in New York: Why were Kirienko, Moiseenko, Novoselov, and others killed; and, if Kolchak is on the side of democracy and universal suffrage, why does he not call a Siberian constituent assembly?

The answers were: The Government of Kolchak is not responsible for those murders, because they were not committed by its orders. True, the Government knew that someone had arrested the Socialists named, but it was unable to prevent the catastrophe in time.

As to the question regarding a constituent assembly, the answer was that it would be convened when Kolchak could be assured that its majority would not consist of Bolsheviki. We must assume, then, that Kolchak believes in universal suffrage only in so far as he is guaranteed a majority, and until such time he intends to remain sole manager—he dislikes the word "dictator." In the meantime, his officers "pick off" the undesirable democrats, who are placed on the list as Bolsheviki. What sort of majority is the Admiral seeking?

We must also assume, apparently, that even the Siberian population does not willingly support the Government of Kolchak, but constitutes instead a dangerous element of probable opposition, whose free voice the Admiral dare not trust. And more than that, he fears not only universal suffrage, but stifles even individual expressions of criticism. For that purpose he has re-introduced in Siberia the famous Article 129 of the Czar's criminal code. That Article, providing for long terms of imprisonment for offending remarks about the person of the Czar, has now

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been made to refer to Kolchak, the Supereme Govenor.

Current opinion abroad notwithstanding, Kolchak is probably quite a small figure in state affairs, but it is practically certain that the directing forces behind him have ambitious and sinister plans. A little event which took place in July, 1917, comes to my memory. On that date Kolchak returned to Petrograd from Sebastopol, where he had held the post of commander of the Black Sea fleet. A few days later a small, yellow, reactionary paper published the names of a new Provisional Government headed by Kolchak. The editor of the paper was the well-known Suvorin, former editor of the monarchist and Jew-baiting *Novoye Vremya*. Kerensky suspended the publication of the paper, and that was his first repressive measure against the press. One wonders now why Kolchak, the democrat and patriot, did not support Kerensky in those dark and trying days of the Provisional Government; why Kolchak, then in Petrograd, did not deny at once his connection with the dark forces of Suvorin?

Difficult as it is for America to understand the Russian problem, Kolchak's manner of realizing his "democratic" principles can at least be understood. He is not able to overcome the rebellious Siberian bands of Semenov and Kalmikov. He crushes the very spirit of democratic community in establishing his own terroristic dictatorship of "law and order."

One cannot help recalling a day in August, 1917, when, during a speech by Tseretelli at the Moscow National Convention, a voice from the Right called out: "Order!" "Yes," answered Tseretelli, "we also want order, but not of your kind, because your order is the dead tranquillity of a graveyard with its even rows of tombstones." If the Europe of the old balances of power and buffer states is gambling for such order, will the people of the New World permit its establishment? Is this the way to save Russia?

III. In Support of Kolchak*

IN these terrible and trying times of bloody ruin that our suffering and worn-out country is passing through, the coöperative organizations of North Russia and Siberia serve as a unifying link for all the honest, healthy, and state-preserving elements of the Russian democracy. In the fight for freedom and for the political and economic regeneration of Russia, the Council of the All-Siberian Coöperative Congresses, uniting in itself all the central organizations of Siberia, has adopted a definite political and social-economic programme in the domain of real, practical, everyday endeavor. This practical programme the United Coöperatives of Siberia are realizing through their local units and representatives in the coöperative organizations, in the Zemstvo self-governments, and social and governmental institutions.

1. In the Political Sphere

(a) The liberation of Russia from the Bolshevist rule which has proved its complete unfitness to create in the land a wise and just state order, civil peace, and freedom, has demonstrated its impotence to reëstablish the ruined national economy, and which is functioning by means of terror and narrow party dictatorship.

(b) The freeing of Russia from all lawless bands from the Right—who are masquerading under slogans of patriotism, and are, in reality, striving to restore the old, outlived régime.

(c) The cessation of civil war and terror.

(d) The organization of state order on the basis of (1) the convocation of a new all-Russian constituent assembly, elected by a general, direct, equal, and secret vote, either in sections, as the freeing of Russian territories from the Bolshevist rule proceeds apace, or in its entirety, after the entire area of Russia has been liberated from the Bolsheviki; (2) a governmental union of all the nations and tribes inhabiting Russia on the basis of national and cultural autonomy; (3) the unconditional recognition of widest democratic self-government for cities and Zemstvos; (4) the regularization of the organs of civil administration, the independence of the organs of military administration, and the mutually coördinated activity of both, within the sphere of the army activities at the front; (5) equality of all and of every one before the law and the courts, universal trial by jury, and the gradual repeal of all special laws and courts.

2. In the Social-Economic Sphere

(a) In the domain of land policies, the United Coöperatives take their stand for the providing of the peasantry with the principal means of its existence—the land; and for the coöperative form of the cultivation of the soil. The land reforms are to be initiated and adopted by the constituent assembly in accordance with the formula, "the land to those who toil upon it," and in consonance with the various forms of land cultivation in the different parts of Russia.

(b) In the domain of labor, the Coöperatives uphold government regulation of relations between capital and labor; the most extensive development of the organized labor movement; reforms that would safeguard to the industrial worker, as well as to other workers, the highest productivity of his labor for the highest possible maximum of enjoyment of the world's cultural and material goods; and the safeguarding of his working conditions.

(c) Inasmuch as labor and knowledge are interdependent factors, the Coöperatives demand the introduction of universal, free, and compulsory education and the development of out-of-school and technical education on a broad scale.

(d) Directing their activities toward the organization of popular industry in coöperative forms of production and distribution, the Coöperatives deem it necessary to work jointly and actively in the regeneration of the economic forces of the land with cultured, staid, private capital, domestic and foreign —in contradistinction from speculative and rapacious capital— upon the condition of a wise and judicious exploitation of the immense natural wealth of our country and without the erection of protective systems of an exclusive nature.

(e) The Coöperatives regard as highly desirable the attraction of earnest foreign capital, the products of foreign manufacturing industries and their technical resources. The United States, with its tremendous enterprise and vast markets can exert a beneficial influence upon the development of the Russian popular economy, the exchange of its wares and goods, and its ruined railway transportation. The development and the fostering of friendly politico-economic connections between Russia and the allied peoples of America, France, England, and other nations, is, therefore, part of the practical programme of the Coöperatives.

The All-Siberian United Coöperatives are fully cognizant of the abnormal conditions in which the territories liberated from the Bolsheviki—the Ural, Siberian, and the North Russian provinces—find themselves, where in pain and anguish a new Russian statehood is arising. The Coöperatives are mindful of all errors and misdeeds committed by the military leaders or the administrative organs here and there. Nevertheless, considering the unusual difficulties connected with the work of the rebuilding and the reëstablishment of legality and order in a land overburdened financially and econom-

*This article forms the larger part of a statement recently issued by the agents in the United States of certain coöperative societies of Siberia and North Russia. While the statement has been repudiated by the vice-president of the All-Russian Union of the Consumers' Societies, we print it for purposes of record as a specimen of the pro-Kolchak propaganda in the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ically ravaged by civil war and hunger, and with a popular psychology corrupted by Bolshevism, the United Coöperatives recognize and support, until the formation of a new, ultimate Government through the constituent assembly, the Provisional Russian Government formed on Siberian territory and headed by Admiral Kolchak. The Coöperatives are lending their support to it as to a practical governmental central power subscribing to democratic principles, which is reëstablishing the state, creating a fighting, disciplined army, and placing itself under obligations to bring the country to the gates of an all-Russian national constituent assembly and to insure its unity and independence.

The Coöperatives, as a social force, uniting in themselves the creative, state-preserving elements of our great land, do not lose sight of their immediate and principal aim—the regeneration of Russia as a free, truly democratic state and her initiation as a full-fledged member into the future League of Nations. Russia is a land of immense possibilities, a land that is essentially foreign to militarism and aggressiveness, and without the regeneration of Russia a durable European peace . . . is impossible.

The programme of the United Coöperatives leads to the salvation of our great country, the land which had once forwarded its fleet into North American waters to the defence of the North American Union, and which had, during the war against German imperialism, sacrificed upon the altar of the common cause of the Allies more than four million lives of its citizens. We have, on our side, state wisdom, equity, and justice. Our adversaries oppose us with terror, violence, and complete social and economic ruin. There can be, and should be, no error of judgment or choice between these two. We firmly believe that the people, the democracy of the United States of America, will side with us and will aid us with their knowledge, their experience, and their resources in converting the greatest tragedy of the Russian people, which is perishing by the hundreds of thousands from anarchy and famine, into a glorious page of regeneration into a free land—a friend of peace and civilization.

Hungary and the League of Nations

By EUGENE S. BAGGER

PROBABLY the most satisfactory solution of the problems arising from the disintegration of the Hapsburg Empire so far offered is the plan of a Danubian confederation of free states as outlined by Mr. Vladislav R. Savić, the Serbian publicist, in his book, "Southeastern Europe." With a sympathetic understanding of the situation, Mr. Savić sets forth the case for a confederation comprising Czecho-Slovakia, Jugoslavia, Hungary, and Rumania, but excluding German-Austria, which, he argues, ought to be permitted, both in the interest of the confederation itself and in accordance with the desires of the German-Austrian people, to join the German republic.

The idea advocated by Mr. Savić is not novel. Kossuth suggested a similar plan. Austrian Slav liberals have favored it. It was revived in 1891 by Take Jonescu, the Rumanian statesman, and before the war Magyar radicals were not averse to it. In several articles, published in American periodicals in the summer and fall of 1918, prior to the collapse of the Central Powers, the present writer argued the justice and advantages of the plan from the point of view of Magyar democracy. Today it has adherents among the liberals of all the countries concerned.

The same idea was endorsed, by implication, in the New Year address, delivered before a meeting of his party, of Count Michael Karolyi, then Premier and later Provisional President of the Magyar People's Republic. Count Karolyi spoke of the "economic unity" of Hungary as distinguished from the old doctrine of territorial integrity. This economic unity could readily have been realized under agreements with the three neighbor states, arrangements for which would have formed the preliminary stage of the forming of the confederation.

The Paris Conference of the Allies likewise received a proposal from an authoritative source, the adoption of which would have gone a long way toward the creation of the basic conditions for the existence of such a confederation. This proposal was incorporated in the plan of a League of Nations submitted by General Smuts. Recommendation II of this document, whose comprehensive wisdom stands more and more sharply in relief with the waning of its influence, reads as follows:

> That so far, at any rate, as the peoples and territories formerly belonging to Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey are concerned, the League of Nations should be considered as reversionary in the most general sense and as clothed with the right of ultimate disposal in accordance with certain fundamental principles. Reversion to the League of Nations should be substituted for any policy of national annexations.

Instead of adhering, in the case of Hungary, to this programme, which would have been welcomed enthusiastically by the first Magyar revolutionary Government without prejudicing the rightful aspirations of Czecho-Slovaks, Jugoslavs, or Rumanians, the Allies, actuated by the twin principles making for justice and democracy known as the "bulwark idea" and the "cordon sanitaire," preferred summarily to order the partition of Hungary. Allied occupation of the contested areas, instead of being entrusted to disinterested British or American troops, was carried out by the troops of the three claimant states, who immediately assumed the rôle, not of the policeman, but of the master of the house. Lines of demarcation were drawn with total disregard for the representations of the Magyar Government, the wishes of the populations most immediately concerned, and the facts of the linguistic map. Supplies from the occupied districts to the parts of the country left under Magyar administration were stopped. The invaders suppressed every manifestation of the will of inhabitants unfavorable to their own aims, confiscated property, annulled the rights of free speech and assemblage, put an embargo on Magyar newspapers, closed Magyar schools, exacted oaths of allegiance from Magyar officials, expelled, deported, or imprisoned "undesirables," abducted hostages, imposed tributes and heavy summary sentences, including corporal punishment—in a word, they acted, short of staging actual massacres on a large scale, as the Germans had acted in Belgium. Finally, the Magyar Government was informed that the lines of demarcation, originally fixed as a temporary military measure, were to be the final political boundaries. Simultaneously, the complete

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surrender of Danubian shipping to the Czechs was ordered.

These methods worked exactly as General Smuts, in his League draft, had foretold they would:

> The application of the spoils system at this most solemn juncture in the history of the world, a repartition of Europe at a moment when Europe is bleeding at every pore as a result of partitions less than a century old, would be incorrigible madness on the part of the rulers, and enough to drive the torn and broken peoples of the world to that despair of the state which is the motive power of Russian Bolshevism.

On the twenty-first of March, the Hungarian Soviet Republic was proclaimed at Budapest as a protest against the results of the "application of the spoils system." However, apart from their sentimental appeal to the world proletariat, and the more or less academic declaration of the alliance with Soviet Russia, the first period, at least, of Soviet Government in Hungary displays few traits which would distinguish it from a thorough-going but "constitutional" Socialist régime. In fact, the *coup* was brought about by the amalgamation of the Communist party with the Social Democrats; and even the intellectual radicals of the professional middle class—in Hungary a disproportionately numerous, highly educated, but, even in normal times, impecunious group—seem to have lent their support. Moreover, the Kun Government solemnly protested its desire to maintain good relations with the Entente and showed the strictest respect for the rights of foreigners—property rights included. The fact is that this Government, though Sovietized and communistic, was at the outset at least, not Bolshevist at all, if Bolshevism means class war by extermination and the spreading of the Marxian gospel at the sword's point. Nevertheless, to refer to the upheaval, as was done by a large section of the Allied press, as "camouflage," as a devilish trick of the Hungarian nationalists, is sheer nonsense, simply another instance of that demonological interpretation of history which was one of the chief weapons of war propaganda. Far from being an intrigue of nationalistic reaction, as organs even of the standing of the *New Europe* would have us believe, the acceptance of Bolshevism by the Magyars may be explained, psychologically, as a reaction *against* nationalism, affording a possibility of escape from the wreckage of a purely geographic structure of government based on national boundaries to a system which attributes little importance to frontiers and to an administration based on geographic divisions.

Liberals in the Allied countries and in America will doubtless endorse the stand taken by the *Manchester Guardian* in an editorial published on March 27, declaring that there is no reason why the Allies should interfere if the Magyars exercise their right of self-determination by setting up a Soviet form of government, as long as they refrain from aggression. The chances are slight that the present rulers of the world will act along the lines suggested by the *Guardian*. Expediency, as conceived by the vision of the Allied heads, will be the sole criterion for dealing with Hungary. It may be assumed that if the Czechs and Rumanians have not so far received orders to crush the Magyar Soviet régime, the reason is simply that it was deemed unsafe to bring Czech and Rumanian soldiers into the close contact with the Magyar Red Army which would be involved in a prolonged occupation.

Soviet or no Soviet, the Hungarian question has to be solved, and that soon, in the interest, not so much of the Magyars, as of the Allies themselves. There are three ways to arrive at a solution. One is by the conquest and subjugation of the country and the people by military force. Another method is the "cordon sanitaire"—military isolation and blockade. This, if conscientiously applied, may, in due time, also result in the extermination of the Magyar people. Apart from these two ways, there is only one other method, that of an equitable disposal of difficulties and of constructing the guarantees of lasting peace and contentment.

Like the German liberals, the Magyars put all their hopes for a better future in the Wilsonian principles as realized by a league of nations. All the greater must be the disappointment of the Magyar people in face of the document adopted at Paris as the Constitution of the League.

This covenant does not even recognize the existence of Hungary. It provides no instrument for liquidating the estates of the dissolved Empires except the mandatory plan. The way that plan has worked in the case of Hungary during the last four months indicates what we may expect in the future. The victors in the war will sit in judgment on the Magyar people and impose whatever settlement they choose—whatever settlement satisfies the requirements of the "bulwark idea," for instance. The League will be definitely formed, will assume its final outlines, will become the depositary and guardian of vested rights and interests before Hungary may even dream of applying for admission.

However, let us assume the time has come when such application may be made. What are the chances of Hungary under the present Constitution of the League?

Article I of the revised covenant rules:

> Any fully self-governing state, dominion, or colony not named in the annex, may become a member of the League if its admission is agreed by two-thirds of the assembly, provided that it shall give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its military and naval forces and armaments.

No one will deny the soundness of the general principle embodied in this clause. If you prepare to join an association, you are expected to conform to its laws and rulings. It is a different question, however, how the provision, in the present circumstances and the present mood of the original membership, or its governing majority, will be applied in practice.

Immediately two points present themselves. The Article quoted speaks of "effective guarantees" to be given by a candidate "of its sincere intention to observe," not the covenant or the by-laws of the League, but "its international obligations." This wording may be necessary for one reason of diplomacy or another. But it is, perhaps, not insignificant in this connection that one of the states which has not been invited to accede to the covenant is Mexico. Now Mexico is not one of the vanquished Central Powers. It is a neutral state. The Mexican people may be charged with pro-German sentiments during the war. In the same sense, and to a certain extent, Sweden was pro-German, as, also, was Spain. But as a state Mexico is neutral, just as Sweden and Spain are neutral. Yet Sweden and Spain have been invited to join the League and Mexico has not. It happens that the Mexican Government does not believe in the private ownership of national resources and openly discourages the ventures of foreign capitalists. What will be deemed, in the case of Mexico, "effective guarantees" of a sincere intention to observe "international obligations"? What are, in the case of Mexico, these "international obligations"? Who is to define

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them? We have one indication. A Washington dispatch, printed in the *New York Times* of April 28, stated:

> Mexico was left out probably . . . because of the stand of the Carranza Government, which England and France have refused to recognize, towards foreign investments in Mexico.

And Mexico has not even a Soviet form of government.

Furthermore, Article I provides that a state applying for admission "shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its military and naval forces and armaments."

This provision may be best viewed in the light of another, namely, Article VIII, which speaks of the reduction of national armaments "to the lowest point consistent with the national safety," but specifies that the Council in making recommendations for such "reduction to the lowest point," shall take account "of the geographical situation and circumstances of each state." It takes no excessive imagination to conceive that the geographical situation of Czecho-Slovakia, for instance, will necessitate a much higher "lowest point" than the geographical situation of Hungary.

Indeed, as various critics have pointed out, apart from the autocratic composition of the Council and from Article X, no provision of the Constitution lends itself more readily to abuses, to the perpetuation of the present status of power, than the clause of Article VIII allowing for different standards in the reduction of armaments.

As far as the effect of Article X is concerned, I shall merely point out that, had the Covenant been concluded prior to August, 1914, the nations of the world would have guaranteed the sanctity of the partition of Poland. Since it has been concluded instead in the year 1919, the nations of the world, by subscribing to Article X, will underwrite the partition of Hungary.

I have attempted to analyze, *in abstracto*, as it were, the status of Hungary under the covenant. But events are hurrying toward the point where such discussion will become purely academic. Today, liberal opinion all over the world stands united in the condemnation of the Constitution of the so-called League as an instrument to sanction and perpetuate whatever injustice the victors in the war see fit to impose upon the vanquished. And we have the testimony of the Peace Treaty summary as to the kind of settlement the Holy Alliance of 1919 undertakes to guarantee.

In fact, the stage has been reached where the question is not whether Germany, Russia, and Hungary shall or shall not be admitted to the League, but whether they will not prefer to form their own counter-league comprising two-thirds of the population of Europe. The danger is not created by the iniquities of the League Constitution. Its root is in the difference, destined to develop into incompatibility, between the two rival concepts of world organization; that of the geographical-political state organized on the basis of capitalism, and that of the communist-syndicalist republic based on voluntary coöperation of independent units, as incarnated in the Soviet form of government. Even though the covenant would probably in any event be unable to eliminate or neutralize this difference, there can be no doubt that the spirit which bars two-thirds of the peoples of Europe from the League, which admits Haiti, invites Venezuela, but ignores Germany and Russia as nonexistent, goes a long way toward forcing the issue.

Because of its strategic position as a salient of Soviet Russia in the body of impoverished, starving, explosive Central Europe, Hungary is destined to be a factor of utmost importance in such a counter-league. This possibility will, no doubt, inflame the political emotionalism of the Magyars; nor can they be blamed for grasping eagerly the new hope—the hope of brotherhood—amidst the ruins of their national existence. It is that last hope in the utter depths of despair without which life is unthinkable for nations as well as individuals. Nevertheless, every sincere friend of Hungary and of a bloodless progress toward a better and brighter world cannot but hope that means will be found before it is too late to remove the inevitable clash between the two rival world conceptions from the plane of armed struggle, a struggle which may herald the end of our entire Western civilization. And the eleventh hour has struck.

Rumanian Rule in Hungary*

By SIGISMOND KUNFI

THE coalition from which the present Hungarian Government has sprung is composed of political parties the greater part of which throughout the war, and all of which since the Russian Revolution, have followed an anti-German policy. In their revolutionary action these parties, in addition to the democratic and social ideas which they wished to realize, were guided by the strong desire to put an end to the Germanophile policy and to the war which was its consequence. It was this moral principle which permitted them to accept the unexpected severity of the military agreement concerning the armistice, and to assume toward their country the responsibility for those extremely severe conditions.

The fact that this Ententophile Government is being treated in a hostile manner by the Allied Powers raises in the public mind the question of what would have been their conduct toward a Germanophile Government and the old régime.

The position of the Government is made clear by the fact that it is able to rely upon the industrial and agricultural working classes, then upon the long-continued impassivity of the small proprietors—a representative of whom has just entered the Government—and finally upon the radical and democratic parties of the bourgeoisie. Its chief opponents are the great proprietors, who are dismayed by the preparations for an agrarian reform comparable to that which has been in force in France for more than a century. Opposed to the Government, further, are the large banks, which have a justifiable fear of being compelled to defray the expenses of the late war out of their enormous profits accumulated during these recent years. In a word, the opposition to the Government is confined to those who have been interested in material ways in the old régime.

All of the producing classes in the country being for the Government, it is possible for the Government to maintain a continuity of order and industry in all the regions under its control—such order and industry as are possible after four years of war and a recent revolution. On the other hand, in the territories occupied by the Rumanians and Czechs there have lately been general strikes in which the laborers and the clerks, the railway employees, etc., have alike par-

*This article was written just before the establishment of the Soviet Government in Hungary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ticipated. This is all the more remarkable because it was precisely these elements whose zeal and honesty, joined to the fact that they succeeded in maintaining order and industry, had made it possible for the Hungarian revolution to be victorious without bloodshed.

If the Allies were willing in economic relations to check somewhat the unjustifiable aspirations of nationalities, the Hungarian Government would be able to maintain perfect order in Hungary. As a matter of fact, however, political and economic pressure caused by the dismemberment of the country, the occupation of the mines, the impossibility of supplying food on account of the interruption and stoppage of traffic, and, on the other hand, the distress of spirit caused by the harsh policy of the Allies, weaken the position of the Government, and it will be necessary to reckon with the awakening of a Bolshevist movement of the most serious kind.

It will suffice to cite two examples. As to the mines, the question does not concern those only which are held by foreign troops. Even in the mines which are under Hungarian control, production is rendered almost impossible by the fact that the Rumanians prevent or obstruct the delivery of the wood necessary to the working of the mines. The consequence of this must be, on the one hand new economic difficulties, on the other a considerable increase in the number of the unemployed. In the occupied territories epidemics, especially typhoid fever, have broken out. In the same regions the foreign authorities wish to force the physicians —an intellectual class, republican in sentiment—to take the oath of allegiance to the Hohenzollerns. The physicians refuse to take this oath and remove in large numbers to Budapest, where there is no need of their services, unless it be to fight the epidemics which likewise menace the overcrowded capital.

Laborers without work, intellectuals without occupation —what can result from this save Bolshevism?

The military agreement is not at all respected, and all of its conditions are daily violated by the foreign military and civil authorities. The Hungarian Government protests in each case—and the cases are innumerable—through the Ministerial Commission on the Armistice, but these protests receive no response. The exasperation caused by this indifference is all the more fatal because the Rumanians excuse their misconduct by the claim that behind them are the orders of the French army of occupation, that is to say, of General Berthelot. A few examples will illustrate the nature of these complaints.

The Ministerial Commission on the Armistice, by Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel Vix.

No. 819,1918,23XII

Baron Horvath, chief of the Kolozsvar section of the commissariat general, reports by telephone. . . .

2. The occupation is of an absolutely military character. It recognizes no distinction from a political or administrative point of view between the territories situated north or south of the line of demarcation.

No. 1766,1919,27-1

I have just received the following telegram: "I have to inform you that Inspector Jenö Sebö, station master at Lupény, has been beaten with cudgels by the Rumanians, during the course of which he was stricken with apoplexy. According to our information he has been put on a train for Nagyszeben. Urge the taking of immediate steps for the release of our station master and his transportation to Budapest. Our action will depend on this. Vàzsonyi,m.p."

We beg you, Colonel, to be so kind as to take steps to prevent any difficulty in removing the said station master to Budapest.

No. 1244/1919,18-1

The Rumanian general Nicolescu, when questioned, declared, but against his better feeling, that the occupation was only a measure to maintain the public order demanded by the military agreement, and had no effects prejudicial to the future formation of the states. But the same general has also declared that it—that is to say, the Rumanian army—is the repository of all power, and the situation is in reality such that martial law outweighs all other law or agreement. The Rumanians are ready with the most varied declarations, but their real attitude is that of an absolute conqueror.

No. 151/1919,281

Report of the station master of Nagyvàrad to the State Directorate of Railways.

Signalman No. 47 was taken, his arms and abdomen cut open and salt placed in the wounds, which were afterwards sewed up and the man hanged head down in the toilets. The employees in the stations of Kissebes and Csucsa have been insulted. We have learned all this from the personnel at Kissebes, which has been rescued by order of the military forces.

I might further multiply these instances, but I confine myself to mentioning one more characteristic event which occurred on the occasion of the general strike in Transylvania, in which the employees and laborers of Rumanian nationality also took part, against the rule imposed by Rumania. At the mines of Pétrozsény, invading troops went so far as to use cannon against the strikers, more than half of whom were Rumanian, and who ceased to resist only on condition that a fair share of the coal mined should be sent to Hungary.

The Hungarian Government has addressed to Paris, through the medium of the French armistice commission, the demand that the holding of general elections for a national assembly be made possible. The Government has received a negative reply, urging that elections at the present time would arouse grave internal troubles. This response has not come to us direct from Paris, but in the name of the commander of the army of the east—in the name of General Henrys.

This refusal does not conform to the anti-Bolshevist policy of the Entente, for after a revolution it is only a national assembly which can lay the sure foundations of a new order in the country. If it is impossible for us to hold elections for this national assembly, it only remains for us to convoke anew the old Parliament with its immense majority of the Tisza party, Germanophile, and responsible for the war. And if the country, in which the old régime has not a single root, will not accept this Parliament, there will immediately be formed, through horror of a vacuum, soviets and soldiers' and workmen's councils. All the more will the Government be unable to maintain itself without some sort of control. On the other hand, it is necessary also for the Allies that the Government which is to sign the peace should be based on a proper representation of the will of the people.

Concerning the claims of the various neighboring states, the Hungarian Government has accepted the principle of the right of free determination of nations. Consequently, the opportunity to make use of this right must be given to all the nations living in the territory of the ancient kingdom of Hungary. The only way to make use of it is by the plébiscite, complete liberty of which can be guaranteed only by the troops of Powers disinterested so far as the territorial questions of Hungary are concerned.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Documents

A New Communist Manifesto

IN answer to a call issued late in January by the Russian Soviet Government, the International Communist Congress assembled at Moscow on March 2 to inaugurate the "Third Internationale." The Congress was attended by thirty-two delegates representing eighteen Communist or Left Socialist parties, together with representatives of fifteen organizations of Europe and Asia who attended in an advisory capacity. The manifesto issued by the new Communist Internationale, a translation of which as published by the *Neutral Press Supplement* to the *Review of the Foreign Press* (British War Office) follows, was taken from the *Christiania Social-Demokraten* of March 29 and March 31.

Seventy-two years have gone by since the Communist party announced their programme to the world in the form of a Manifesto drawn up by the two greatest teachers of the proletarian revolution, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Communism, which had barely stepped into the arena of battle, was already surrounded by the lies, hatred, and persecution of the wealthy classes. The latter, and justly so, foresaw in communism a deadly enemy. In the course of these seventy odd years, the development of communism has encountered troublous times; first the march to the assault, then periods of defeat, again a further advance, but followed by serious reverses. Nevertheless development has continued on the lines indicated in the party's Manifesto. The period of the last decisive struggle has begun later than was desired or expected by the apostles of social revolution. But it is here; it has come. We Communists, representatives of the revolutionary proletariat in different countries in Europe, America, and Asia, now assembled in the powerful Soviet city of Moscow, both feel and consider ourselves to be the followers of, and participants in, a cause for which the programme was drawn up seventy-two years ago. Our duty is to gather together the revolutionary experiences of the working classes, to free the movement from the harmful interference of opportunist and social-patriotic elements, to unite the forces of all genuine revolutionary parties in the world proletariat, and thereby to facilitate and hasten the victory of the Communist revolution.

I. Now that Europe is covered with smoking ruins, the most ruthless of the incendiaries are searching for those who are to blame for the war. They are backed by their professors, politicians, journalists, social-patriots, and other supporters of the bourgeoisie.

For many years past it has been predicted by socialism that an imperialist war was inevitable and that the cause of the war lay in the insatiable greed of the wealthy classes on both sides and in all capitalist countries generally. Two years before the outbreak of war, at the Basle Congress, the responsible Socialist leaders in all countries pointed to imperialism as the cause of the impending war and threatened the bourgeoisie with the Socialist revolution as the vengeance of the proletariat for the crimes of militarism. And yet, after five years' experience, after history has disclosed the robbery committed by Germany and the no less criminal acts of the Entente states, the state Socialists and their Governments in the Entente countries are still going on with their revelations concerning the fallen German Kaiser.

Far worse are the German social-patriots, who in August, 1914, spoke of the Hohenzollern diplomatic White Book as the nation's most sacred gospel, and now, in cringing servility to the Entente Socialists, accuse the fallen German monarch—whose slaves they formerly were—of being guilty of the war. They hope that in this way their own guilt will be forgotten and they will thus curry favor with the victors. But side by side with the fallen dynasties of the Romanoffs, the Hohenzollerns, and the Hapsburgs, and with the capitalist cliques of those countries, the Governments in France, England, Italy, and the United States present but a sorry aspect viewed in the light of events of diplomatic disclosures.

Up to the very outbreak of war, British diplomacy preserved a mysterious secrecy. Civil authorities were careful not to make it known that they intended to take part in the war on the side of the Entente, doubtless so as not to alarm the Berlin Government and put off the war. London wanted war; hence their action to make Berlin and Vienna build their hopes on England's neutrality, while Paris and Petrograd were sure of England's intervention.

The war, which had been prepared for decades, broke out through direct and conscious provocation on the part of Great Britain. The British Government reckoned on giving support to Russia and France until they were exhausted and at the same time had crushed Germany, their mortal enemy. But the strength of the German military machine proved too formidable and called forth not only an apparent, but an actual intervention in the war on the part of England. It was the military superiority of Germany that caused the Government at Washington to give up their apparent neutrality. The United States assumed, as regards Europe, the same part that England had played in former wars and has tried to play to the last, namely, the plan of weakening the one side with the help of the other, by joining in military operations for the sole purpose of securing for themselves all the advantages of the situation. Based on the American tombola method, Wilson's stake was not high, but it was the last and he won.

During the war, mankind has gone through the most terrible sufferings of starvation, cold, epidemics, and moral collapse owing to internal differences in the capitalist system. The academic controversy within [the ranks of] socialism regarding the impoverishment theory and the draining of capitalism through socialism has by this means also been finally decided. For years past statisticians and pedants have exerted themselves to collect from all corners of the world both real and fictitious facts to show how prosperity, in certain groups and categories of the working classes, was on the increase. But we are faced today with the harrowing reality of impoverishment not only of a social nature, but physiological and biological also.

This imperialistic war catastrophe has with one swoop swept away all the gains of experts and parliamentary struggles, and in like degree it has come into being from the inner tendencies of capitalism as well as from the economic agreements and political compromises which it has now engulfed on the field of blood.

Finance and capital, which plunged mankind into the abyss of war, have gone through alarming vicissitudes during the war. Paper money, as dependent on the material basis of production, has had a severe shock. In proportion as it has gradually lost its value as the capitalistic medium and regulator for the circulation of goods, it has become simply a means by which to requisition stolen goods; in short, [it has come] to be used as a military economic force. The complete falling off in the metal fund reflects the universal and deadly crisis in the capitalistic circulation of goods. Although for many years previous to the war, free competition as a regulating factor for production and transactions of vast economic import had been eliminated within the trust and monopoly system, it has been proved that in the course of the war its regulating functions were taken out of the hands of the economic groups and transferred direct to the military state power. The distribution of raw materials, the working of the oil fields at Baku and in Rumania, coal from the Don region, corn from the Ukraine, the German locomotives, the railway carriages and automobiles, the supplying of starving Europe with bread and meat—these fundamental questions of the world's economic life are all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regulated, not by free competition, nor by combines of national and international trusts, but by the direct use of military force in the continued interest of self-support. Finance has thus not only completely militarized the state, but itself as well, and is no longer capable of carrying out the most important economic functions other than with the sword and blood.

During the whole war the opportunists invariably exhorted the workmen to show moderation, assuring them of a gradual transition to socialism, and now they call again for self-sacrifice on the part of the proletariat in order to recover from the terrible effects of the war.

The nationalization of economic life, which was so obstinately opposed by capitalistic liberalism, is now an accepted fact. Not only is there no possibility of a return to free competition; there is none either to trusts, syndicates, or other economic marvels. The only question is, who in the future is to conduct nationalized production, the imperialist state or the victorious working-class state? In other words, is the whole of laboring mankind to become serfs and day-laborers under a victorious international clique, which, in the name of the League of Nations, and assisted by an "international" army and an "international" fleet, alternately plunders or casts a morsel of bread to the needy, but everywhere keeps the proletariat in chains with the sole aim of retaining its own power; or shall the working classes in Europe and the most civilized countries in other parts of the world take into their own hands the shaken and ruined world economy and thus ensure its restoration on the basis of socialism?

To bring to an end the prevailing crisis will only be possible with the help of proletarian dictatorship, which will not look back to the past nor show consideration for inherited privileges or rights of property, but will bear in mind the necessity of saving starving multitudes, and will mobilize all their forces for that purpose; will introduce a general obligation to work and a régime of discipline in work, and will in this manner, in the space of a few years, not only heal the gaping wounds caused by the war, but succeed in raising mankind to heights hitherto undreamed of.

II. The national state, which gave such a mighty impulse to capitalist development, has become too restricted for the continued development of the productive forces. This will create an awkward position for the small states that lie between the Great Powers in Europe and other parts of the world. The small states have come into being at different times as fractions of larger ones, and as payment for various services rendered, or as strategical buffers; they have their dynasties, their ruling cliques, their imperialistic claims, and their diplomatic connections. Until war broke out their illusory independence was on the same footing as the equilibrium of Europe: ceaseless opposition between the two imperialistic camps. The war has upset this equilibrium. At the start the war gave Germany an enormous superiority, thus compelling the small states to seek their welfare and salvation in the magnanimity of German imperialism.

After the German defeat, the citizens of the small states, together with their patriotic "Socialists," appealed to the victorious Entente imperialism, and began to search the hypocritical points of the Wilson programme for guarantees for their continued existence as independent states. At the same time the number of small states has grown larger, new states have separated themselves from Austria-Hungary and from the Czarist Empire, which, as soon as they were formed, have started disputing over frontiers. Meanwhile the Entente imperialists have prepared such a combination of new and old small states as would bind them over to mutual impotence on account of their mutual hatred.

Nevertheless, these Entente imperialists, although they oppress and persecute the small and weaker nations and let them suffer starvation and distress in exactly the same way that the imperialists of the Central Powers recently did, still go on talking of a nation's right to self-determination, which at present, both in Europe and in other parts of the world, is being utterly trampled underfoot.

The only means of securing the possibility of a free existence for the small nations is by a proletarian revolution which releases all the productive forces in every country from the tight grip of the national states, unites the nations in the close economic coöperation based on a joint social economic plan, and grants to the smallest and weakest nation the possibility of developing its national culture independently and freely without detriment to the united and centralized economy of Europe and of the whole world.

III. The last war, which was certainly a war for the sake of colonies, was also a war that was waged with the help of the colonies' populations, on a scale never before known. Indians, Negroes, Arabs, Madagascans, all fought in the European contingent—and for what? For their right to remain in the future the slaves of England and France. Never has capitalistic power been more disgraceful; never has the slavery problem of the colonies been shown up in a more piercing light. This is the cause of a series of revolts and revolutionary risings in all the colonies. In Europe, there is Ireland reminding us by furious street fighting that she is still an oppressed country and feels herself to be so. In Madagascar, in Annam, and other countries the troops of the bourgeois republic have been obliged during the war to suppress more than one rising of colonial slaves. As to India, revolutionary ferment has not been absent there for a single day, and latterly there have been huge workmen's strikes in Asia. The British Government took action by armored cars in Bombay.

In this manner the colonial question, in all its bearings, is the order of the day, not only around the green table at the Paris diplomatic Congress, but also in the actual colonies. At the best, Wilson's programme will only effect a change in the signboard of colonial slavery. The liberation of the colonies will only be feasible in conjunction with the liberation of the working classes in the mother countries. Not until the workmen of England and France have overthrown Lloyd George and Clemenceau will the workmen and peasants, not only in Annam, Algiers, and Bengal, but also in Persia and Armenia, have a chance of an independent existence. In the more highly developed colonies the fight is already proceeding not merely under the banner of national liberation but with a social character quite openly expressed. If capitalistic Europe forces the most backward parts of the world into the whirlpool of capital, Socialist Europe will come to the aid of the liberated colonies with its technique, its organizations, and its spiritual influence, to facilitate their transition to a methodically organized Socialist establishment.

Slaves of the colonies in Africa and Asia! The hour of proletarian dictatorship in Europe will be the hour of your release!

IV. The entire bourgeois world accuses the Communists of crushing liberty and political democracy. This is not true. When the proletariat comes into power it merely confirms the utter impossibility of making use of the methods of bourgeois democracy. It creates conditions and forms for a new and higher workmen's democracy. The entire process of capitalistic development undermined political democracy (especially during the last imperialist epoch), not only by dividing the nations into two irreconcilable classes, but also by condemning numbers of the smaller bourgeois and semi-proletarian camps as well as the lowest class of proletarians, to a state of permanent economic misery and political impotence.

The working classes in those countries whose historical development allows of it, have made use of political democracy to organize against capital. The same will happen later in countries where the conditions for a workmen's revolution are not yet ripe. The Bavarian or Baden peasant, who does not see beyond his own church steeple; the French grower of vines, who

LIBRARY
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is ruined by the great capitalistic adulteration of wines; the small farmer in America, robbed and cheated by bankers and representatives—all these social groups, shut out by capitalism from the wide path of development, are called nominally to administer the state by the régime of political democracy. In reality, however, all important questions concerning the fate of nations are decided by the financial oligarchy behind the back of the parliamentary democracy. Such, above all, was the case in the question of the war, and this will be repeated now that it is to be applied to peace.

When the financial oligarchy consider it advisable to conceal their acts of violence at parliamentary elections, they have the bourgeois state at their disposal, with all the varied means inherited from previous centuries, and developed by the marvels of capitalistic technique: lies, demagogism, provocation, contempt, bribery, and terrorism.

To expect that the proletariat in the final settlement with capitalism, when it is a question of life and death, should meekly as a lamb agree to the demands of the bourgeois democracy, would be the same as to expect a man, defending his life and existence against thieves, to follow the arbitrary rules of French wrestling, laid down, but not adhered to, by his enemies.

In this realm of destruction, where not only the means of production and transport but also the institutions of political democracy lie scattered and bleeding, the proletariat must create its own apparatus, which, above all, must serve as a means of reunion for the working classes and secure for them a revolutionary intervention in the further development of mankind. The Workmen's Councils constitute this apparatus. The leaders of the old parties and old trades unions have shown themselves incompetent to understand the tasks presented by the new epoch and still more incompetent to carry them out. The proletariat creates a new form of apparatus comprising the entire working class, irrespective of their being ripe in an expert and political sense—an apparatus so elastic that it can always be renewed, always be extended, always attract fresh groups within its area, and open wide the doors for the groups of workers in town and country who are in close touch with the proletariat. This invaluable organization for the self-administration of the working classes in their fight for, and in future also, in their conquest of, state power, has been tested by experience in several countries, and is the greatest conquest and the most powerful weapon for the proletariat of our day.

V. In all countries where the masses are awakened and have begun to think, workmen's, soldiers', and peasants' councils are constantly formed.

To consolidate the councils, to strengthen their authority and place them in a condition to oppose the bourgeois state machinery, is at present the chief task of the honest and conscientious workers in all countries. With the help of the councils, the working classes can extricate themselves from the dissensions caused by the war and the infernal pangs of hunger, the arbitrary rule of those in power, and the treachery of former leaders. Through the Councils it will be easiest and quickest for the working classes to come into power, and through them they will be enabled to administer all that has to do with economic and cultural life, as is now the case in Russia.

The collapse of the imperialist state, from the Czarist to the most democratic, is proceeding simultaneously with the collapse of the imperialist military system. The armies of millions mobilized by imperialism were only capable of resistance as long as the proletariat remained bowed under the yoke of the bourgeoisie. The collapse of the national unity is synonymous with the inevitable collapse of the army. Thus it happened first in Russia, then in Austria and Germany. Similar events may be expected in other imperialist states. The revolt of the peasant against the landowner, of the workman against capitalism, the revolt of both combined against monarchical or democratic bureaucracy, must inevitably lead to the revolt of the soldier against his officer, and later to a sharp division between the proletarian and bourgeois elements in the army. Imperialist war, which opposes one nation against the other, is followed by civil war where class is opposed to class.

The outcry by the bourgeois world against civil war and the Red Terror is the most abominable hypocrisy ever noted in the history of political fighting. There would be no civil war if the profiteering cliques who have brought mankind to the verge of ruin did not oppose all progress on the part of the working masses, and if they did not bring about conspiracies and murder and call in armed assistance from outside to protect or restore their thieving privileges.

Civil war is forced on the working classes by their mortal enemy. The working classes must return blow for blow, unless they would prove faithless to themselves and their future, which is also the future of all mankind. The Communist parties never try by artificial means to encourage civil war, but exert themselves, as far as possible, to shorten the duration of it, and, if it does become an imperative necessity, they endeavor to keep down the number of victims, and above all to secure victory for the proletariat. From this will clearly be seen the necessity of disarming the bourgeoisie and arming the proletariat and thus raising an army for the protection of the power of the proletariat and the inviolability of the Socialist social community. Such is the Red Army of Soviet Russia, which has arisen for the purpose of protecting the conquests of the working classes from all attacks, whether from inside or outside. The Soviet army is inseparable from the Soviet state.

VI. Fully conscious of the world-historical character of their undertaking, the enlightened workmen, as the first step in organizing the Socialist movement, aimed at an international union.

The foundation stone was laid when the first Internationale was formed at London, in 1864. The Franco-German war, from which emanated the Germany of the Hohenzollerns, undermined the first Internationale, at the same time giving an impulse to the national Labor parties. Already, in 1889, at the Paris Congress these parties united and created a second Internationale. But during that period the centre of gravity of the labor movement rested entirely on national grounds, within the limits of the national states, on the basis of national industry, and within the province of national parliamentarism. The organizing and reformative work of decades produced a generation of leaders, the majority of whom accepted textually the programme of social revolution, but disowned it in practice. The opportunist character of the leading parties in the second Internationale was finally revealed, and led to the greatest rupture in world history at the very moment when the course of events called on the Labor parties for revolutionary fighting methods. If the war of 1870 dealt the first Internationale a severe blow in disclosing that the social revolutionary programme was not backed by powerful united masses, the war of 1914 has killed the second Internationale by proving that, dominating the fraternal masses of the workmen, stood parties transformed into the cringing organs of the bourgeois state.

Not only does this apply to the social-patriots, who have become quite openly the popular and trusted men of the bourgeoisie and the reliable executioners of the working classes, but also to the fluctuating and uncertain Socialist Centre, which is endeavoring to restore the second Internationale, that is to say, the narrow-mindedness, opportunism, and revolutionary impotence of its leaders. The German Independent party, the present majority of the French Socialist party, the Menshevist groups in Russia, the Independent Labor party in England, and other similar groups did, as a matter of fact, try to fill the place occupied by the old official parties of the second Internationale by putting forward their ideas of compromise and unity, and thus, by all means in their power, paralyzing the energy of the proletariat, prolonging the war still more, and adding to the misery in Europe. The fight against the Socialist Centre is a necessary factor in the fight against imperialism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In repudiating the vacillation, mendacity, and superficiality of the Socialist parties, we—the united Communists of the third Internationale—feel ourselves to be the direct successors of a long series of generations, heroic champions and martyrs, from Babœuf to Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

Even though the first Internationale foresaw the coming development and inserted a wedge, and though the second Internationale collected and organized millions of proletarians, still it is the third Internationale that stands for the open action of the masses and for revolutionary operations.

Socialist criticism has thoroughly stamped the bourgeois world-order. It is the duty of the International Communist party to overthrow that order, and to establish instead the system of Socialist order.

We appeal to labor men and women in all countries to join us under the Communist banner, under which the first great victories already have been won.

Proletarians in all lands! Unite to fight against imperialist barbarity, against monarchy, against the privileged classes, against the bourgeois state and bourgeois property, against all kinds and forms of social and national oppression.

Join us, proletarians in every country—flock to the banner of the workmen's councils, and fight the revolutionary fight for the power and dictatorship of the proletariat!

A French Labor Declaration

THE following declaration, addressed "To Public Opinion, To the Workers," and signed by the Confédération Générale du Travail, is taken from *l'Humanité* of April 18.

From August, 1914, to November, 1918, we were told repeatedly that we were fighting the war of right. This assurance implied that peace would confer upon the nations the liberty of self-determination and that it would be based on general disarmament, the only possible method of liquidating the debts of war.

Today these solemn promises are being broken. Our diplomats offer us a plan of a League of Nations which is not the society of nations described in the Fourteen Points of President Wilson. The peoples of the whole world in their thirst for justice have acclaimed these fourteen propositions. We have made them ours.

The French working class, faithful to its conception of "war against war," rises against the sabotage of peace.

On coming out of torment, the nations cannot be condemned to have no other object than the payment of taxes destined to support the burden of armament.

The Confédération Générale du Travail condemns any foreign policy of blockade, of force, of diplomatic or armed intervention.

It recalls the formula of the French Revolution: "Each nation by itself has the right to make its laws, the inalienable right to change them; to wish to despoil a foreign people of that right is to become the enemy of the human race."

The C. G. T. vigorously protests the expedition against Russia, a friendly country against which no declaration of war has ever been made.

The continuation of this policy of intervention makes France a power guarding the privileges and the reactionary institutions of all countries.

The working class, the French people, can never subscribe to this humiliating and dishonorable attitude.

Since liberty of thought and opinion was the very foundation of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, the C. G. T. appeals to public opinion, to the conscience of the trade union organizations, to agitate against this state of things.

The C. G. T. condemns any continuation of the war, and urgently demands the conclusion of a real peace to which all peoples can subscribe.

Foreign Press

A British Plan for Industrial Peace

THE Joint Committee of the National Industrial Conference in Great Britain, which was directed to report on "the causes of the present unrest, and the steps necessary to safeguard and promote the best interests of employers, workpeople, and the state," made public its findings and recommendations just prior to the meeting on April 4 of the Conference of Employers and Employees, to which the report was submitted. The following analysis of the more important provisions of the report is taken from an editorial in the London *Economist*.

The most novel feature of the report is its plan for the establishment of a permanent National Industrial Council. The Council would consist of 400 members (200 appointed by the employers' organizations and 200 by trade unions), with the Minister of Labor as chairman. It would meet at least twice a year, and its functions would be to advise the Government on industrial questions, to issue statements for the guidance of public opinion on industrial matters, and to consider general questions affecting industrial relations, measures for the avoidance of disputes, actual disputes involving general questions, and legislative proposals affecting industrial relations. The Council would have a standing committee of fifty members (twenty-five appointed by and from the employers' representatives, and twenty-five by and from the trade unionists), with a chairman (without a vote) appointed by the Government. Its duty would be to "take such steps as it deems necessary to carry out the objects of the Council," to consider questions referred to it by the Council or the Government, reporting its decisions to the Council, and to call additional meetings of the Council when necessary. The expenses of both the Council and the standing committee would, subject to Treasury sanction, be defrayed by the Government.

Any attempt to allay industrial unrest will be welcomed at the present time, and the unanimous recommendations of a body as representative as this Committee are entitled to respect. It is, however, worth recalling that some of the most important unions—notably the Big Three and the Associated Society of Engineers—were not represented on the Committee, and took no part in appointing it. Moreover, the decisions embodied in its report are the decisions of officials—which, as bitter experience has taught us, do not always coincide with the opinions of the rank and file or of the local "men on the spot," who have so often proved to be the real leaders of the labor movement. It is at least doubtful whether some of the proposals put forward in the report will give general satisfaction in labor circles; the suggested method of dealing with war advances, for example, amounts practically to compulsory arbitration, which has long been anathema to trade unionists, and some of the provisions for adjusting hours of labor come dangerously near to being open to the same objection. Nor can we see that these proposals, even if they were generally accepted, would go to the root of the trouble. A minimum wage and a forty-eight hour week might indeed satisfy the demands of some industries, and they would be a real blessing to unorganized trades. But the danger to industrial peace comes mainly from the highly organized trades, which would not long be content with the statutory standard, and it is not apparent how disputes and difficulty in arriving at agreements would be avoided by giving the agreements, when they are arrived at, the force of law. And is an industrial parliament representative of industry as a whole, however useful its advice may be to the legislature, likely to be much more fruitful of agreement than direct negotiation between the parties concerned? Universal recognition of the unions and the development of machinery for negotiation where

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is deficient (both of which the report advocates) would reduce the danger of dispute to some extent. But it would be foolish to imagine that these proposals, or any hastily designed panacea, can solve the whole problem. The memorandum presented by the trade unionist members of the Committee, and printed as an appendix to the report, though it shows traces of collectivist bias and attributes to the working classes a clearer consciousness of their aims and the implications of their demands than most of them possess, has at least this merit: that it insists that nothing short of a thorough investigation and overhauling of the industrial system can give us industrial peace. Nor can any investigation be satisfactory which does not take full account of the new currents of opinion and the new organizations which have developed in the trade union movement in recent years. A new situation has arisen which calls for new and far-reaching departures in industrial organization—newer and more far-reaching than the Government, and even some of the "leaders" of labor, have yet realized.

The Central Hull Bye-Election

FOUR months after the General Election in England, when a Coalition Unionist was returned to Parliament for Central Hull by a vote of 13,805 to 3,434, a bye-election in the same district was won by Lieutenant-Commander J. M. Kenworthy, Independent Liberal, by a majority of 917. The Coalition Unionist vote dropped to 7,699 and the Liberal vote increased to 8,616. The significance of his election is discussed by Commander Kenworthy in the following article taken from the *English Review* for May.

On the 8th of March, while serving in a ship stationed in the Humber River, I received a totally unexpected invitation to contest Central Hull in the Liberal interest in the bye-election caused by the death of Colonel Sir Mark Sykes.

The Unionist majority at the General Election was 10,371, and the seat had returned a Conservative or Unionist for thirty years.

So, from the mere point of view of winning the seat, the prospects were not bright. And I had found at the General Election that earnestness and sincerity alone were not sufficient under the then circumstances to gain the suffrages of the new electorate.

The result of the West Leyton bye-election was not then known, it must be remembered.

But a survey of the political situation to date showed a vista so black and menacing that I determined to take the opportunity of being temporarily ungagged (a naval officer is supposed to have no political opinions!) in order to try and throw light into dark places.

We had been told during four and a half years of bloodshed and misery that we were fighting to make an end of war as the normal means of settling disputes, to make the world safe for democracy, to redeem and protect the small nations of Europe, and to make a better England.

The armistice was signed on the 11th of November, 1918. What has happened during the five months following?

A General Election has been held in which the Government has gone to the country on a platform which for sordidness, appeals to cupidity and brute passion, and lack of common honesty and truth is surely unparalleled in the political history of any country.

As a result, a House of Commons has been elected which one of the Dominion statesmen describes as the worst constituent assembly he has known anywhere.

The policy indicated by the Government at the General Election, and the triumphant majority of reactionaries, profiteers, armament makers, brewers, and landlords returned by a temporarily misled electorate has had a world-wide result. Deep calls to deep across the continents. The revived prejudices of the Republican Senators in the United States against the League of Nations, the chauvinism in certain French and Italian political and journalistic circles, the reckless landgrabbing of Poles, Bohemians, and Rumanians, the desperate struggle of the Spartacus and Independent Socialist parties in Germany, the revival of militarism in Central Europe, and the labor unrest in Great Britain, can all be partly traced to the General Election of 1918 and its deplorable result.

So in Paris we see long months of haggling in secret reproducing the worst evils of secret diplomacy—which we thought we were fighting to destroy.

The policy of governing by naked force continues in Ireland and Egypt, weakening in its turn the liberalising and moderating forces which England should be applying in Paris. How can Mr. Lloyd George support President Wilson's ideals with his eyes looking over his shoulder at such a House of Commons in London, and with our failures in Ireland and Egypt writ large for all the world to read? What case have we to put to Italy in resistance to her mad demands for the port of Fiume, certain as these demands are, if satisfied, to lead to another conflagration in Europe in the future into which our own country will surely be drawn?

A draft scheme of a League of Nations has been produced in Paris. It is a little step towards the new world order. But the League proposed is a league of officials nominated by the various Governments who have blundered into or seized power. There is no provision whatever for a council elected by the peoples or their parliaments.

And following hard on this draft covenant of the shadow of a League, come estimates for vast armaments in England clearly foreshadowing preparations for a new great war in the future. Without giving the voluntary system of recruiting a fair trial, it is proposed to retain nearly a million of soldiers, with power to increase this to over two millions, apparently without consulting Parliament, and a huge navy and air force for no one knows what mad purpose.

And finally, there is the sordid policy towards our old ally, Russia, and the iniquitous blockade, starving two-thirds of Europe into anarchy, and ruining British trade at the very time when it is necessary for our financial position to be restored before disaster and bankruptcy overtake us, too.

Or, take the proceedings at home during these past few critical months. Just as our diplomatists are shown to have been utterly unprepared for peace abroad, so are our politicians at home discovered to have been unprepared for "reconstruction"—blessed word!—at home. There has been inexcusable delay in tackling the housing and land problems; a refusal to meet the perfectly just demands of labor until a catastrophic strike of the "Triple Alliance" is threatened; no apparent attempt to disband the horde of officials and bureaucrats, male and female, who have sprung up in our midst during the war; and there is no hint of any levy on the fortunes made during, and because of, the war, too often by corrupt means, while we were losing the best of our youth on the battlefields of Europe.

I accepted the invitation to contest Central Hull. I described myself as the spokesman of hundreds of thousands of the surviving fighting men like myself, inarticulate but aghast at the pass to which our great country has been brought, and at the impending ruin of all Europe.

I spoke plainly of these matters and burked no issues. Everywhere my views were received with acclamation. On polling day an unknown workman came to me, shook me by the hand, and "hoped I would win the election for the sake of humanity."

I, personally, cannot hope to accomplish much in this House of Commons. But the result of the election should be a sign to the blind leaders of the blind in London, Paris, and Rome that democracy is on the march, and the mere beating of the drums of "patriotism" by second-rate heroes in Parliament or Fleet Street will not satisfy the sovereign people.

The present Government must give the people a real peace at home and abroad or make way for a Government of the proletariat.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Agriculture in Spain

A SPECIAL correspondent of the Paris *Temps*, M. P. Dehillotte, gives in a recent issue of that paper the following account of the agricultural situation in Spain.

That the labor conflict in Barcelona and the agitation in the Andalusian country occur at the same time is not only a coincidence, but a symptom and a prophecy. Social peace, as M. Baldomero Argente has recently written in the *Heraldo de Madrid*, is very difficult to preserve when it is attacked at the same time by the workers of the city and by those of the country. It is evidently dangerous for public authority to be attacked by both at the same time. There is never a pause in which to execute the decisions that have been reached.

All social problems in Spain may be divided into two groups, the trade union problem and the agrarian problem. Which of these two demands attention first? It is difficult to say, so urgent is the solution of each. The agrarian problem, however, should be of particular interest to the Government because it presents, in contrast with the trade union problem, the possibility of a sufficiently durable solution corresponding to the actual state of society. Some agree, however, with M. Baldomero Argente that the two problems are so closely related that in the fields of Andalusia is sure to be found the solution of the Barcelona labor problem. It is certain that if the Barcelona disturbances can be checked by remedial measures in Andalusia, the social peace of Spain will no longer be seriously endangered.

In Andalusia, where I have just spent several days, the situation is as follows: too many agricultural workers and too few proprietors. All the other social problems of the country are the consequence of this defective social structure; land owners too few and too wealthy, workers too numerous and too poor. The result is emigration *en masse* in Castile, popular disturbances in Andalusia. The only solution for this state of things is to diminish the number of poor workmen and to increase the number of proprietors. A practical remedy must be found before the deadly evil has accomplished its work. With the aid of Bolshevism one phase is on every Andalusian lip—the distribution of the land. The illiterate agricultural workers say these words perhaps in the hope of a revolutionary upheaval which would some day put them in possession of the vast stretches of territory which at present only bring them a ridiculous wage, barely sufficient to maintain a badly-nourished, miserable existence. They do not consider that such a division into so many square metres a head would in a few years bring complete ruin.

The weather conditions in this part of Spain are so different from those of France that it is impossible to replace large ownership by small. The necessary irrigation, now organized by large estates, could not be used profitably on a land cut up and parcelled out. Immense tracts of land must frequently be left fallow and treated with fertilizers, so that they may be sown two or three years later. The large landowner can afford to skip his normal crops only by cultivating with more intensity the rest of his estate. What would happen to the worker without resources, who had become owner of a tract of land that could be cultivated only intermittently, under the handicap of a climate less favorable than that of France?

Some measures ought, nevertheless, to be taken. Immense territories remain uncultivated and are used as game preserves by the rich landowners. Official statistics estimate that in Spain, in an approximate total of 50,450,688 hectares, 24,055,547 hectares are not cultivated. It is possible to improve this situation greatly. On the other hand it is necessary to remember that Spanish land is mountainous and rocky over a vast expanse and cannot be completely cultivated.

Definite measures should not be taken until the local governments have made an accurate survey of the arable land. This survey made, the Government should proceed by a general increase of wages, and by distributing the fertile lands now badly cultivated or not cultivated at all to those who might be called exploited, so that a disastrous parcelling of the land may be avoided. In our day a wage of one franc fifty or two francs has become impossible on account of the cost of living. This impossible situation exists in Andalusia. In the redistribution of the land the Government must choose among the workers' development associations proposed by the Socialists and the reformers, the Catholic associations endorsed by M. Antonio Monedero, president of the National Catholic Agricultural Confederation, and, finally, societies of colonists who will share with the landowners—a plan advocated by eminent members of the conservative group, such as M. Sanchez de Toca.

A wave of Bolshevism is passing over Andalusia. At San Luccar some agricultural workers a few days ago burned the barns to show their discontent at insufficient wages. The example of revolutionary Russia nationalizing the land has made a vivid impression on the simple soul of the Andalusian peasant. The workers who have already arrived from all parts of Spain for the olive season bring with them propagandists and professional agitators determined to exploit the trusting simplicity of the countryfolk.

The Government, then, finds itself facing a problem which any statesman, influenced by the hazards of an impending Ministerial crisis, would not approach without hesitation. It is necessary to give a large measure of satisfaction to the just demands of the working class, and to preserve the agricultural wealth of a country which would be ruined by excessive division.

Hungarian Hospitals

THE *Journal de Genève* of April 21 prints the following account of the appalling conditions in the Hungarian hospitals.

The reports from the delegates of the International Committee of the Red Cross, at present on a mission in eastern Europe, which are daily received at Geneva depict the fearful desolation of the hospitals at Budapest.

The maternity hospital, for example, the Frauengeburt Stadtspital, where 1,600 births take place annually, has no sheets. The patients lie upon the mattresses, under wretched covering, in unheated rooms. The new-born are wrapped in old rags. At the end of eight or ten days, mother and child are sent home, destined for the most part to die of hunger and cold. Other unfortunates have already taken their places upon the soiled mattresses which cannot be washed because materials, fuel, and soap are entirely lacking. Disinfection is impossible.

At the ophthalmic hospital the same destitution is found. Patients suffering from glaucoma are condemned inevitably to lose their sight as a result of the lack of medicine which is absolutely indispensable. The condition of the military reserve hospital No. 4 and that of the "Augusta" (Augusta Barackenspital) is still worse. The patients, wrapped in summer coverings, lie upon straw mattresses. In order to keep from dying of cold, those who have enough strength to get up have to walk about the rooms, day and night, to keep warm. In the complete absence of dressings for wounds, wadding and paper are used. The dearth of medical supplies is general. The arrangements for disinfection cannot be carried out owing to the scarcity of charcoal. There has been no body linen for some time. The reserves of linen consist of dirty rags.

At the Rokucscentralspital for surgery and internal disorders, it is impossible to obtain boiling water for the slightest operation. But it is at the Garnisonspital, that "waiting-room of hell," to quote the terrible and true description given by the doctors of the institution, that the distress reaches its maximum of horror. An extract from the text of the report reveals this nightmare: "In this hospital you find the most pitiful of

LIBRARY
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

human beings, the insane, the paralytic, and the ataxic, all requiring the most thorough-going cleanliness, huddled together and devoured by the foulest vermin; deprived of water and fire, with dirty beds to sleep on in the icy rooms swarming with lice, it is impossible to put any disinfection into practice."

The nutrition in general and especially in the hospitals, is absolutely insufficient; it is no longer a matter of diet. The semblance of food which is given to the sick serves only to prolong their miserable lives a few hours or a few days. In order to succor the thousands of unfortunates in the hospitals of Budapest, of Prague, and of Vienna (reports are to be had of Dr. Ferrière, member of the International Committee of the Red Cross and delegated to Vienna in December, 1918), and of other cities of eastern Europe, in accordance with the memorandum of the International Committee addressed to the Peace Conference on March 10, which has appeared in the press, it is imperative that the lifting of the blockade be considered by the Allies without delay, and that the hospitals be the first to benefit by the renewal of medical supplies and nourishing food. The cry of sick and dying humanity must be heard. It is necessary to act and to act quickly.

A Scandinavian View of Soviet Russia

AN interesting and objective view of present conditions in Russia was brought back by Michael Puntervold, a Norwegian lawyer and Moderate Socialist deputy, who undertook an "observation trip in Russia" to ascertain the actual facts of Soviet rule. The following article by Deputy Puntervold, one of a number which have lately appeared in Scandinavian papers, is taken from the *Tidens Tegn* (Christiania).

Will spring bring a great Entente military intervention in Russia? That is the greatest military and political question of the hour. "Possible, but not probable," said Lenine, when I put the question to him recently. And Lenine is undoubtedly right. The statements issuing from the Entente show that its military-political leaders are either disagreed about what to do or entirely at sea about what they ought to do. In order to estimate correctly the political situation, it is necessary to know the facts. But the isolation policy practiced by the Entente has logically resulted in leaving Soviet Russia for months—and that in the crucial time of consolidation and settlement—as unknown as Stanley's dark continent, though in the middle of Europe. Even the Stockholm members of the Vorovsky legation were clearly quite ignorant of what was really happening in Russia, as I could illustrate with incidents from my journey in their company from Stockholm to Petrograd and Moscow. . . .

The Entente has had to build chiefly on the stories of exiled Russians. Emigrant literature is always interesting as a personal record, and may be of value as illustrations in the great picture-book of what has already happened. But the individual experiences of the fugitives of executions among their immediate family and friends are naturally not likely to create that cool and dispassionate frame of mind which is necessary in order to form a judgment of what ought further to happen. The nobility and autocracies of Europe were not wise in listening to the French emigrants who advised intervention against the French citizenry of 1789. The American-European bourgeoisie of 1919 will hardly serve its own interest and that of civilization by a military or economic intervention of force against the Russian workingmen's régime of today.

During the observation trip in Russia which I have just completed, I earnestly tried to ascertain the attitude of the opponents of the Bolsheviki toward an Entente intervention; and I wish to say in advance that the present rulers of Soviet Russia never attempted, directly or indirectly, or by any form of espionage, to prevent me from carrying on my observations freely and secretly. It is my conviction that an Entente invasion now in 1919 would be met with almost unanimous opposition from practically all elements of any importance in the whole of Soviet Russia. With a single and that a rather half-hearted exception, all the political personages whom I had an opportunity of meeting in Russia were agreed—whatever their stand toward Bolshevism—on one point: that an Entente intervention now would be the worst thing that could happen and would only serve the interests of the blackest reaction.

Let me begin by quoting Martov's answer to my questions. He is the undisputed leader of the Mensheviki. He said: "It is absolutely untrue when the European press says that there is still a sentiment for Entente intervention here in Russia. Under the leadership of the Mensheviki, a campaign has been started which has opened the eyes even of the smaller bourgeoisie to the danger of such intervention to our own political development. On this point the Mensheviki stand solidly with the Bolsheviki," Martov continued, "and the other political parties, in so far as they have begun to come to life and lift their heads after the worst Bolshevist storm, have made similar declarations or will make them as soon as they are again allowed to open their mouths." Martov gave his personal reason for his opinion as follows: "If imperialistic Europe makes a ring of reaction around Russia, and if it throws its tremendous military power against the Red Army, the Red Army will be defeated by the great regular armies. But does the Entente gain anything for that democratic idea which it is said to champion? As the Bolsheviki have already wiped out every democratic tendency in the great Russian masses for the time being, the masses will remain passive and accept the Government that is forced upon them, no matter how reactionary it promises to be. If, on the other hand, Wilson and the Allies were to make peace with the Bolsheviki, and lift the blockade, Russia and democracy would have a better chance. When the country is not forced to make war on a national basis, the Bolsheviki will be compelled to concentrate their efforts on the colossal economic tasks awaiting them. And then the real working men, the social democracy, will begin to exercise a pressure that will force the Government into a normal development with the irresistible impetus of a natural law. The result will be that the Bolshevist Government will have to swing over to the path of universal suffrage, in fact of parliamentarism, although it may well be that our parliamentarism will be a Russian modification of that which obtains in Western Europe. That is the reason why we are opposed to intervention."

The standpoint of the Mensheviki is practically that of the Right Social-Revolutionaries. (As for the Left Social-Revolutionaries, it is a curious fact that they now occupy a position so far to the Right of their old allies, the Bolsheviki, that they have not yet been sufficiently "legalized" to have any authoritative party leadership within the borders of Soviet Russia.) The exception which I mentioned above was an old *trudovik* leader, but even he was not a positive interventionist. He asked with much interest: "What do you think of intervention? And do you, who have read other than Bolshevist papers, believe the Entente will intervene?" I replied that as a Social Democrat I was, on principle and as a matter of course, opposed to a bourgeois intervention against a country ruled by working men, and that I did not believe the Entente would take any active military measures, although they might keep up the blockade for some time to come. To which the man replied: "As an international Social Democrat I am disposed to agree with you, but I only want to chronicle the fact that we shall be dead of starvation within six months." The man lived in Petrograd, where people are actually starving in the fullest sense of the word, even those who, like the *trudovik*, belong to the first class—"erste kategori der fresser," as he called it with an ironic gesture in the direction of the crust of bread which constituted his only visible provisions for the coming twenty-four hours. It was a bitter commentary on the starvation policy of the Entente. It is true, we cannot deny that the Bolsheviki are largely responsible for the famine by their failure to organize the transportation system of the interior of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia, but this is at least a sin of infirmity. The starvation policy of the Entente, on the other hand, is a sin of malice—the slow mass murder of a whole people, in particular of the inhabitants of Petrograd, who have been in the habit of getting their food supplies by way of the Baltic. The instigators of the blockade, without serving any "democratic idea," are causing to suffer most those whom they would perhaps prefer to aid, the bourgeoisie and the *intelligentsia*. The Entente would best aid democracy and establish the most potent means of cutting away the excrescences of Bolshevism and creating happier, more settled conditions in Russia (and thereby throughout the world) if they would send an armada loaded with food to the city on the Neva. For hard cash, if you will! A continued starvation blockade can only result in more deaths and may perhaps, before many months, create a chaos which even the most rabid hater of socialism would admit to be worse than all the Bolshevist dictatorships in the world. We have a long road to travel before we reach the ideal state, and a still longer one before we reach socialism, which is to follow the present "transition stage"—to use the terminology of the Soviet Constitution. But Lenine has at least created out of chaos a real, organized administration with the power and the centralizing effect of a Government. That is more than either Czarism or Kerensky could give a country which had fallen into anarchical atoms after four years of disastrous war. Some dictatorship was necessary in Russia, and I presume it is chiefly a matter of class sentiment whether one prefers it red or black. But if the workingmen's Government also should fall to pieces, then the world would see a chaos or a reaction the like of which we hardly dare to dream of. There is at present no party except the Bolsheviki which is capable of forming a Government, and no other class of society that can take the place of the organized part of the proletariat as the ruling class. Possibly this is in part due to the Revolution itself, but it is at any rate a fact today. Intervention a year ago and intervention now are two essentially different things.

From a military point of view as well the situation is entirely different. Instead of the marauding and demoralized bands of deserters of the time of Kerensky, the Entente would now meet the new Red Army of Trotzky. "In the spring we shall have 100,000 trained young Red officers and 3,000,000 soldiers"—that is the assertion commonly made. It can at least be said that the Red Army is a more important military factor than the 14,000,000 soldiers that the Czar's Government had on paper, and that the literary man, Trotzky, and the lawyer, Pozern, in Petrograd, are Ministers of War with a firmer purpose than was ever shown by the declamatory Kerensky. In order to create a disciplined army, Trotzky has not shrunk from introducing again the old military rules of Czarism in every important particular. I have a copy of the new regulations before me, and it is—save for a few insignificant proof-reader's and editorial changes—a complete reprint of Grand Duke Nicholas's old Blue Book. (It might now be called a Red Book.) Instead of the double eagle we have the five red stars of Soviet Russia and its insignia, the hammer and the plough. Formerly Paragraph 1 of the regulations declared it to be the duty of every able-bodied citizen to defend the Czar and the fatherland, while in the newly-printed regulations of the Soviet, Paragraph 1 declares it to be the duty of every able-bodied citizen to defend the Revolution and the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic.

General conscription has long since been introduced and established by the Constitutional declaration of the Soviet Republic, of July 10, 1918. It is true, Paragraph 19 makes the honorable duty of defending the Revolution the privilege of the workers only, while the non-working elements are ordered to perform other war service, but as we are talking of Russia, we shall be wise if we distinguish between decrees and facts. In reality the "non-working elements" have to do whatever there is to be done. . . .

All other considerations have to give way to the one purpose: to create as quickly as possible a regular army that can take up battle even against the veterans of Europe if need be. The law of necessity sweeps aside all dreams of a people's army and all phrases about people's meetings. When Kerensky introduced capital punishment again at the front there was tremendous agitation within the Bolshevist camp. Now the Bolsheviki have themselves established courts martial and capital punishment at the front for military offences. The Soldiers' Councils no longer elect the officers, who, after finishing their training, are appointed by the Government without even consulting the Councils. The latter have been deprived of all authority within the domain of the military command. The duty of saluting has been introduced again, and the day before I left Moscow there was even issued a decree to replace the insignia of rank on the officers' sleeves! In short, there is in almost every field a forced march back to the old bourgeois military discipline; only a few labels are still lacking. The result of all these concessions to the old militarism, however, is that Trotzky now can muster a very considerable military force with a very fair amount of discipline. The new Red officers (or commanders, as they are known in the new terminology) have, to be sure, a minimum of training—eight months for those who can read and write and know a little more than the Lord's Prayer, four months for those possessed of a fair education—but it should not be forgotten that the training is carried on under the high pressure of war, and that much of the drill takes place in a rain of bullets. To wrest Russia now from the "Red Army of Workmen and Peasants" would be something more than a military promenade. And even if they were defeated in battle, there is the vast country of unending steppes, now as in Napoleon's time, rebounding like gutta percha from every attack. The conquest of Petrograd by Finnish troops means nothing. "Then we shan't have to feed that starving town. Let the Entente do it! They'll have their hands full!" Even the fall of Moscow is not the same as the fall of Lenine. And think of the ferment in the homelands which would follow an Entente invasion!

The world needs peace, Russia first and foremost. And the Government of the country desires it. No doubt the meeting on Prince's Island was a still-born project, but there are Tchitcherin's notes unanswered. His doves have not yet returned with the olive leaf; this in spite of the fact that he would probably be willing to let Soviet Russia take over the debts of Czarist Russia as well as to give important concessions. Possibly the Entente thinks Lenine wants another Brest-Litovsk peace, another breathing-spell. I have reason to believe that this is not his purpose. The Bolsheviki are themselves admitting that they are not able to socialize or nationalize all the economic life of Russia, and their policy of giving concessions is therefore to be taken seriously. And even in their relations to the other Russian states with which they are at war, it might be possible to find a platform for that peace which the suffering Russian people and the whole world besides now have a right to demand in the name of humanity and civilization.

Contributors to this Issue

GEORGE V. LOMONOSSOFF, lately director of the Railway Department of the Russian Soviet Bureau in the United States, has just left for Russia to undertake the task of reorganizing the railway system under the Soviet Government.

GREGORY ZILBOORG, who acted as secretary to the Ministry of Labor under the Provisional Government of Kerensky, has recently arrived in the United States from Russia.

SIGISMOND KUNFI, formerly Minister of Public Welfare in the Hungarian Cabinet under Karolyi, is also a member of the "Council of Five" of the present Soviet Government of Hungary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

A PROTEST against the adoption of a policy of dismemberment in regard to Turkey and the territories of the Near East now under British occupation has been submitted to the Right Honorable A. J. Balfour by His Highness the Aga Kahn, Ameer Ali, Shaik M. H. Kidwai of Gadia, and other Turkish personages. The memorandum, while approving the proposal to form self-governing states within the Turkish Empire, opposes the suggestion to sever them completely from the Empire. It declares that such a policy would create resentment among the vast Moslem population of India as well as among the Afghan and other frontier tribes. In any event, it is urged, the proposed autonomous states should not be withdrawn from the spiritual suzerainty of the Sultan as Caliph. Under the Sunai system of jurisprudence, local rulers are invested by the Caliph, which investiture gives them prestige in the eyes of the people and renders uprisings against them illegal. To retain this ceremony, the memorandum urges, would not only conciliate Moslem feelings, but would be a guarantee of peace among the peoples of those countries. A strong protest is made against the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine on the ground that the country is closely associated with the Moslem religion and religious traditions, and that only one-seventh of the population is Jewish. Measures for safeguarding the interests of the Moslem population in devising a new Government for Armenia are also advocated.

THE work of distributing unemployment subsidies in Berlin is described in the *Vossische Zeitung* for April 7. It is estimated that three hundred thousand workers in the city are unemployed, while a hundred thousand more have only partial employment. These people report at thirty-eight offices managed under the joint supervision of the city administration, the Berlin provision association, the trade unions, and the workers' council of unemployed. Although a ticket system is in use, a certain amount of swindling occurs; while the situation is complicated by the fact that wages in many places outside of Berlin are less than the unemployment donation.

BY a royal decree published on March 14, the municipalities of Spain have been authorized to tax the increase in value of the land under their jurisdiction. The tax ranges from 5 to 25 per cent., according to the value of the property, and is levied upon the amount by which the sale price of the land exceeds the cost price. The municipalities may modify the proposed percentage by making the rate of taxation proportional to the number of years during which the increase in value has accumulated. The Secretary of the Treasury states that the Spanish Government has for the past ten years advocated the establishment of a land values tax.

THE women Socialists of the Lower Seine have submitted to the Socialist Federation of France a resolution defining what they believe should be the Socialist attitude toward war. Beginning with the statement that from the bourgeois point of view war is legitimate, the resolution declares that from the Socialist standpoint it is in all its aspects criminal; that the Socialist conscience, which repudiates all anti-humanitarian measures, does not seek to distinguish between the degrees of crime perpetrated by the warring Governments, but is bound by the principles of humanity and fraternity to condemn all alike. Recognizing that Socialists in the various countries may be obliged to submit to military service imposed upon them by capitalist Governments, just as they have been obliged to submit to similarly imposed economic servitude, it nevertheless enjoins them from lending to the crime of war any moral, intellectual, or political support, and calls upon Socialists in all countries to remember that in time of war their duty is not to espouse the cause of one imperialism against another, but to bear in mind the Socialist purpose to overthrow all imperialism. After a recognition of the necessity for defensive warfare against capitalist states by countries in which the proletariat has come into power, the resolution concludes with the declaration that lasting peace will be brought about only through universal revolution.

AN article on Russian currency, prepared by the Russian Division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, appeared in *Commerce Reports* of April 19. Since the latter part of the Kerensky régime, small notes, popularly known as "Kerenki," have been in circulation. They are printed in large sheets, bear neither signature nor date, and, according to the statement mentioned above, are easily and extensively counterfeited. Bonds of the Russian Liberty Loan, in denominations of twenty, forty, and one hundred rubles, are circulated as currency, and there are also in circulation a large number of coupons of various loans, issues of banks, etc. The coupons are unpopular because they are very small, and the amounts, besides being difficult to distinguish, are for odd and inconvenient sums, such as one ruble, thirty-seven and one-half kopecks. Notes of the Czarist régime, popularly known as "Romanovki," are still in use, although they are becoming rare.

TO investigate the problems of labor and employment in Japan, a "Labor Protection Association" was recently formed within the Tokio Chamber of Commerce by a group of business men and Government officials. Within a short time the new organization had secured $250,000 with which to carry on its work. Mr. Oka, Superintendent General of Police, is president of the Association and two leading merchants of Tokio are the vice-presidents.

THE *Journal des Débats* (Paris) of April 12, published a Pekin dispatch stating that certain Chinese politicians were conducting a vigorous campaign for the internationalization of Chinese railways. The campaign, which is opposed by the press of China as an attack upon Chinese sovereignty, is understood to be primarily directed against the French interest in the Chinese railways, which is much larger than British, German, or American interest. The Chinese Government is reported to have instructed its delegates to the Peace Conference to prevent, if possible, any discussion of the question by that body.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
John A. Hobson, London.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandinavian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Washington.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED